

amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 480. A bill for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2121. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2122. A bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2123. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain aid to Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2124. A bill to further expedite the national defense by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, to diminish the causes of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2125. A bill to provide for the refund of all penalties paid with respect to the 1941 and 1942 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2126. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Womble, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2128. A bill for the relief of J. Aron & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2129. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2133. A bill for the relief of William Taft (deceased); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 2135. A bill for the relief of Albert D. Castleberry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 2136. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 2137. A bill for the relief of William A. Roberts, father of David Ernest Roberts, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the President and Congress to revise the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

237. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress to relieve persons in active military service of the United States from payment of income taxes or gross income taxes on their compensation received from the Government for such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

238. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the safeguarding of livestock sanitary welfare and the livestock industry of the Nation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

239. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any modification of sanitary acts against the importation of meats from countries known to be infected by hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

240. By Mr. SCHWABE: Memorial of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri to the Congress of the United States, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to the effect that any citizen in any county in any State thus organized under the Federal Social Security Act may be informed upon request made to his local social security board of the names of any recipients in any branch of the Social Security Department and the respective amounts of money each is receiving, or has received during the past year, and to liberalize the Social Security Act so as to remove the many limitations and conditions placed upon the States before they may obtain Federal funds, also to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general secretary of the Anti-Saloon League of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sale of intoxicants to men and women in service uniforms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

242. By Mr. ANGELL: House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Oregon State Legislature, asking the Congress to defeat Senate bill 246 and House bills 1012 and 1115; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, on this holy day in the Christian year we fain would join the vast company of pilgrims around the world who reverently pass through the portals of Lent. Whate'er our name or sign, we, too, would follow the wounded feet of that Master of men who has invaded more realms, conquered more lives, taken possession of more hearts, swayed more wills than has any other figure across the long centuries. We, too, would gaze at that one Face set steadfastly against cushioned ease and cowardly compromise and which has become forever the living symbol of the might and majesty of meekness and of ideals and principles worth dying for.

For these weeks ahead leading to the gloom of Calvary and the glow of Easter, in the midst of our crowded and complex modern life, may we find some quiet cloister of the spirit, may we still the tumult a little, so that, opening long shut doors to the Unseen and Eternal, we may hear His voice. Coming to these days of the Passion with the sackcloth and ashes of penitence, may we enter with sincerity that we may come out with strength and joy. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON DEFERMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, March 10, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On December 15, 1942, I appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Paul Bellamy, chairman, Mr. Ordway Tead, and Mr. Eric Johnston for the purpose of making an independent study and recommendations to me on the question of deferments of Federal employees from induction in the military service.

This committee, after applying itself industriously to its task for more than 2 months, has now presented its report. For the information of the Senate, I am transmitting herewith a copy of this report and of the Executive order which I have signed giving effect to the committee's recommendations.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TABLES OF BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, submitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE
(S. Doc. No. 19)

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Los Angeles Parlor, No. 45, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to investigate the alcohol production plant of the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, of Yankton, S. Dak., with a view of determining the possibility of the establishment of a synthetic rubber plant at Yankton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUSHFIELD, on the 9th instant, p. 1699, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 38, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products

"Whereas with the increasing demand on the farmers of the United States to meet the food requirements of our fighting men and lend-lease commitments, at the same time assuring the people of the United States of the proper amount of foodstuffs, it is essential for the war effort and the well-being of our people that a study be made of the complicated problems of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; and

"Whereas farm products should be properly graded and distributed when and where needed, at fair prices both to the producer and the consumer, and immediate steps should be taken for a coordination of efforts and the adopting of a comprehensive and workable plan in betterment of the interests of the producing farmer and the consumer; and

"Whereas House Resolution 38 has been introduced into Congress providing for the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, which study and investigation are imperative at this time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (The senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature urge the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 38; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

By Mr. McNARY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows, to wit:

"Whereas there are now pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America, three bills identified as S. 246, H. R. 1012, and H. R. 1115, each of which provides amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; and

"Whereas the amendments provided in such bills, if enacted into law, will have the effect of completely nullifying every State right to regulate, control, and tax the ownership and operation of aircraft owned and operated exclusively within the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas such amendments will deprive the State of Oregon of every opportunity and means of fostering, promoting, and regulating the local development of aircraft and the rapidly expanding air-transportation industry; and

"Whereas such proposed enactments will stifle the development of aircraft and air transportation by individual citizens by bringing under Federal planning and control all civil aeronautics both for commerce and pleasure; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon insists upon maintaining its reserved right to legislate independent of Federal Government interference, on all matters of local concern, including intrastate development of aeronautics; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is opposed to the principle of usurpation of all State rights by the Central Government and believes the above identified pending congressional bills are based upon that principle: Now therefore

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (The senate jointly concurring):

"1. That we, your memorialists, the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States of America, and the Members of Congress from the State of Oregon, to give unfavorable consideration to and to defeat the enactment of S. 246, H. R. 1012, and H. R. 1115.

"2. That a copy of this memorial be sent to the Honorable United States Senators CHARLES L. McNARY and RUFUS HOLMAN, and to Congressmen JAMES W. MOTT, HOMER D. ANGELL, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and that they be and they hereby are urged to use their best efforts and influence to make this memorial effective and the secretary of state hereby is instructed to transmit the same to them.

"3. The secretary of state be and he hereby is instructed to send a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the United States of America, the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, and the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend full statehood to the Territory of Alaska

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has an area of 586,400 square miles, one-fifth as large as the United States, has a population of 72,524 according to the 1940 census, was approved by Congress as a territory on August 24, 1912, and now, due to war, has an estimated population as large as Nevada; and

"Whereas the area was purchased on March 30, 1867, for the sum of \$7,200,000, since which time it has produced in gold and copper alone \$722,222,000; is rich in the strategic metals tin, tungsten, platinum, mercury, nickel, and palladium; has an estimated timber stand of over 85,000,000,000 board feet; and

"Whereas the Territory produces a salmon fishery output of \$40,000,000 yearly; and

"Whereas due to the present war emergency and to the further demand by the people of the Western Hemisphere that the countries of North America be joined by motor roads, and the Government of the United States is pledged to spend many millions of dollars on the Alcan Highway; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has no congressional representative and is limited to 1 delegate; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada believes that full representation of this Territory should be granted by establishing a State of the Territory now within the boundaries of Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to extend to the Territory of Alaska full status of a State of the United States, thus assuring full representation in Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, and to each of our Senators and Congressmen in Washington, D. C., requesting their support in this matter."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF INDIANA LEGISLATURE—ARMY PHARMACY CORPS

Mr. WILLIS. I present and ask to have appropriately referred a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a pharmacy corps in the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 997 and S. 216 to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not now afforded the men serving in the Army and is not compara-

ble to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competency and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a pharmacy corps in the Army, which will have the authority required, and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture, standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, That the Indiana General Assembly now in session, goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to establish a pharmacy corps within the Army; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the Indiana Members of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The following reports of the Committee on Naval Affairs were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 784. A bill to amend that part of the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 619), relating to disposition of profits from sales of ships' stores; without amendment (Rept. No. 100);

S. 800. A bill to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 101); and

S. 853. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1912, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; without amendment (Rept. No. 102).

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE AGREEMENTS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report back without amendment the bill (S. 813) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, the extension of the so-called lend-lease agreements for an additional year, and I submit a report (No. 99) thereon.

The report advocates the extension of the so-called lend-lease agreements for an additional year. Let me say to the Senate that the committee gave the matter very careful and meticulous attention. We had before us the extensive hearings held before the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs. In addition, there appeared before us the Lend-Lease Administrator and the Secretary of the Navy. Also we

had the benefit of other information which was available. After the most deliberate consideration, the committee voted unanimously to report the bill favorably.

Furthermore, the committee very carefully considered the wording of the report which I herewith submit, and in all respects it approves the terms and the language of the report. Such an occurrence is so unusual in the Senate that I want to call the attention of Members of the Senate to it.

So I ask that the report be received and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 857. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Arthur Dewitt Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 858. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of co-operative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 859. A bill providing for cancellation of penalties for farm marketing excess of wheat for the years 1941 and 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 860. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 861. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INCOME TAXATION—THE RUMPL PLAN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Stuart C. Rand, an eminent attorney of Boston, an exceedingly illuminating letter on the subject of taxation, and, because I believe its contents will be helpful to Members of the Senate, I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART,
Boston, Mass., February 16, 1943.
Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I hope you will feel that this letter is not merely a personal squawk about taxes, although there is probably something of that element in it.

I am writing to urge that you give your support to the Ruml plan. For years I have made a comfortable living income, and I have no objection whatever to paying heavy taxes. I am glad to do it, and I take pride in doing it. The Federal taxes, however, have risen so

rapidly that I have not been able to keep pace with them in any annual program of savings. I know that many others have gone through the same experience. I start the year 1943 with a simply staggering tax debt. As in the case of other lawyers, my annual income is apt to fluctuate greatly. My income for 1943 might easily be no more than my tax debt to the Government, and possibly less than my tax debt to the Government. If I earn enough this year to pay my ordinary living expenses, carry my modest insurance program, and pay my taxes to the Federal Government, I will start the year 1944 with an equally staggering tax debt. This is a perpetual treadmill from which thousands of people see no escape even by the most rigid program of savings. May it not be a mistake to put a large group, particularly of professional people, into this perpetual treadmill? Personally, I believe that it is.

If it is not possible now to say that taxes paid during the year 1943 shall be taxes on the 1943 income, I urgently suggest that the law be so changed that taxes payable during 1944 shall be considered taxes on 1944 income, so that at least by January 1, 1944, taxpayers may realize that they will not be starting that year with a staggering load of debt which they may or may not be able to meet. I firmly believe that if Congress can accomplish this they will have general approval throughout the country. Please understand that this is not any kick against paying high taxes. It is a protest against what seems to me the tragic unwisdom of forcing a large percentage of the population to start each year with an inescapable load of debt which they may or may not be able to discharge and which, in the event of death during the year, would leave their estates either insolvent or severely crippled.

Very sincerely yours,

STUART C. RAND.

AWARD OF AGRICULTURAL A FOR FARM PRODUCTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 4, 1943, the Milwaukee Farmers Club wrote a letter to Hon. Claude Wickard in relation to the subject of an agricultural A award for those doing an outstanding job in the production of food. I ask, Mr. President, that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 1943.
Subject: Agricultural A award.
Hon. CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Milwaukee Farmers Club unanimously petition you to arrange for the awarding of suitable recognition to those farmers who are wholeheartedly cooperating with the Government's agricultural program, and who are doing an outstanding job in producing food for victory.

It is our suggestion that this recognition be in the form of an agricultural A on the same general lines that war industrial plants and workers have been awarded the Army-Navy E, Maritime M, and similar awards.

It is our belief that too few farm men and boys are appreciative of the fact that their work on the farm is just as important a war job as the neighbor boy's who is working in a war plant in town.

There is a feeling of inferiority on the part of the farm boy who is still just working on the farm, when the factory worker proudly exhibits his importance in the war effort by wearing his Army-Navy E pin.

The publicity that would follow the awarding of agricultural A awards would do much to add a little glory to the tedious farm job,

and help put the farmer on an equal patriotic base with his brother in the city war plant.

We urge your taking steps to get such a program under way as quickly as possible.

If you wish, we would be happy to submit a suggested plan more in detail, and we are sure members of our club and other similar organizations will be happy to work with you in formulating the plans for carrying out this program.

Yours for victory,

MILWAUKEE FARMERS CLUB,
VAN B. HOOPER, President.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I may say that months ago I suggested that an agricultural E instead of an A be awarded to those who are doing an outstanding job in agriculture.

In some of our States there is State recognition of the importance of the outstanding producing farmers.

This gives me an opportunity to say something about the farm problem. At long last some of our mistaken columnists and editorial writers are waking up to the plight of the farmers and the food shortage menace to the Nation. Many of the columnists and editorial writers have had something to do with this situation. Do we not remember how in the past they have lambasted the farmers and the so-called farm group? They could not comprehend that the farmer was entitled to the cost of production. All they could do was fill their columns with the worst kind of sabotage material.

On March 4, 1943, Mr. McNutt issued an order deferring farmers from the draft. In most instances it was a case of deferment after the farmers were already in the service. At long last Washington is beginning to realize that now the prospect of getting production even equal to last year's does not look very good.

The county agents of the country finally were canvassed. I made the suggestion months ago on the floor of the Senate that the county agents be canvassed to ascertain the situation in relation to (a) manpower on the farm, (b) farm machinery. Instead of that, the matter was delayed, and in February a survey was made of the 3,000 county agents, and they predicted an alarming reduction in spring planting. Why? Because of the lack of workers on the farm and in many instances inadequate machinery.

If we are going to get production, we will have to get workers back onto the land. America will have to go into victory gardening.

Yes, Mr. President; I am in favor of the idea contained in the letter written to Secretary Wickard to give the boys who produce an agricultural A.

ADDRESS BY HON. THURMAN W. ARNOLD
AT BANQUET GIVEN IN HIS HONOR

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the program and the address delivered by Justice Thurman W. Arnold at the dinner given in his honor on March 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF VOLUNTEER WOMEN
WORKERS TO TRAVEL COMFORT OF
MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mrs. Lionel Atwill, chairman of a committee of 500 women engaged in contributing to the travel comfort of members

of the armed forces, on the occasion of the presentation of a cup to Mrs. Mason Gulick, on March 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRADE AGREEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM
THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Trade Agreements," published in the Washington Star of January 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD SHORTAGE—EDITORIAL FROM SAN
FRANCISCO EXAMINER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bureaucratic Rule Brings Food Shortage," published in the San Francisco Examiner of March 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SMALL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY NAT BASS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of small business, delivered by Mr. Nat Bass at the American Business Congress, New York City, February 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—STATE-
MENT BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Jay Franklin relating to the free enterprise system, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE
OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICUL-
TURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for the committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Connally	Kilgore
Austin	Danaher	La Follette
Bailey	Davis	Lodge
Ball	Downey	McCarran
Bankhead	Eastland	McClellan
Barkley	Ellender	McNary
Bilbo	Ferguson	Maloney
Bone	George	Maybank
Brewster	Gerry	Mead
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Brooks	Green	Moore
Buck	Guffey	Murdock
Burton	Gurney	Nye
Bushfield	Hatch	O'Daniel
Byrd	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Capper	Hayden	Overton
Caraway	Hill	Pepper
Chavez	Holman	Radcliffe
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb

Reynolds	Tobey	Wherry
Scruggam	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Smith	Vandenberg	Willis
Stewart	Wagner	Wilson
Taft	Walsh	
Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALL-GREN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is my desire to discuss the question now before the Senate, namely, the deferment of farm workers from military service under the Selective Service Act. I ask the indulgence of Senators not to interrupt for questions or requests for me to yield until I shall have finished my statement. I believe that in this manner my statement may be more clearly placed before the Senate than if it were broken up with arguments. When I shall have concluded presenting my side of the case, I shall be glad to answer questions which Senators may propound.

In stating the issue which was so ably debated and discussed yesterday, I may say that the purpose of both proposals before the Senate is the amendment of section 5 (k) of the Selective Service Act, dealing with the deferment of farm workers. There are two bills on this subject before us, and we are asked to pass one of them. One we will call the Bankhead substitute, which is offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. The other bill, in the form of an amendment, may be called the O'Mahoney amendment, offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

I speak at this time in favor of the Bankhead substitute, because I believe it will give the needed relief. I am against the O'Mahoney amendment, because in effect it does not change the present law, and under the present law the food problem of the country has grown serious and dangerous.

The deferment at this time of farm workers would be in direct aid of the war effort of this country. From the facts which have been placed before us, both from the statements of the Government

departments, dealing with agriculture, and the statements of individuals interested in that work, I am convinced that such a step is essential to strengthen this country at war.

Whatever may be said of the Bankhead substitute whatever attacks may be made upon it by its critics, it will attain its prime purpose, which is the keeping of American men on the farms, there to raise crops for all our people, both those in our armed services and those in civilian employment.

From discussions outside this Chamber it seems some are not impressed with the serious farm question which this Nation faces.

Only a few citations of facts and opinions are necessary, and the opinions which are considered should come from sources that know the subject of food production. They should know about the production of other necessary agricultural crops, but, in particular, they should know about the production of food.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, addressed a question to the county farm agents of this country, the question being as follows:

Has farm labor in your county been appreciably reduced by farm workers joining the armed forces of every kind, either as volunteers or as selectees under the draft law, and by leaving the farm to work on industrial or war production?

The Secretary received 2,780 replies to that question and 99 percent of those reporting indicated that farm labor had been appreciably reduced by being absorbed by the military forces or by industry.

Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday containing an article to which I wish to refer. The title of the article is "United States Must Eat Animal Feed, Says Wickard." I wish to read a portion of the article, written by John Fisher:

The public will have to eat animal feed as substitutes for meat, according to Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard.

That's what he told a Senate appropriations subcommittee recently, according to testimony at the secret hearing disclosed yesterday.

Under questioning by Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Democrat of Rhode Island, ardent New Dealer, who contended that solution to the food problem lay largely in getting the people to eat less, Wickard replied that rationing will take care of that and substitutes are under consideration.

MORALE CITED AS FACTOR

"We have about reached the place now where we cannot expand our meat production any more, because we are not going to have enough of the basic element, feed, to support much more increase," said Wickard.

"And we are going to have to start with some of these grains (as substitutes), eating them ourselves, rather than feeding them to animals and eating the animals. That is a change in the diet of this country, and our people cannot change diets suddenly I think, without affecting their morale, and increasing the amount of food they consume. We are getting people to do it gradually, and we are doing all we can in that direction."

NEARING BRITISH LEVEL

"It may be that it will, if you don't want to keep up the feeding of the Russians and the English," replied Wickard.

He said we are approaching "pretty rapidly" the level of nutrition in Britain, and experts have been sent to England to study their use of the short rations available.

"They have cut down their consumption and have found out better ways of feeding people," Wickard asserted. "But here in this country we have to produce not only for our own people and our Army, but foods for these other nations. * * * If we had more food, we would give it to the Russians and not cut down on the British. And even though we cut down the consumption for our civilians, there would still be an unlimited demand from our allies."

Mr. President, I read this article particularly in view of the statement made yesterday by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, that he had been informed that there were 500,000 more beef cattle in this country than there were before the war. It strikes me as quite strange that a statement should come from the Secretary of Agriculture that the people must eat feed appropriate for cattle rather than that it be fed to cattle because there are not enough cattle to feed the people.

I have before me letters written by persons directly interested in farm production, and upon the point of the need of the proposed legislation I wish to read short excerpts from them. They come from various sections of the country.

The first letter is one from the Coolidge-Florence Farm Bureau, Coolidge, Ariz., and the letter contains this statement:

Our difficulties in obtaining farm help during the past season have been doubly discouraging. A considerable shortage existed during the production season, but this paled to insignificance when the time came for harvest. During the earlier months we had lost portions of our feed and seed crops for want of the necessary labor for gathering them.

From another letter written by Hon. J. B. McLaughlin, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of West Virginia, under date of February 13, 1943, addressed to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Economic Stabilization Director, I read the following excerpt:

The partial black-outs in the showcases and shelves, and grocerymen closing their doors every day is an indication of an appalling food shortage that may be expected before the year is out, and if not remedied immediately may be disastrous.

Reading from the same letter I quote this sound statement:

The farmer is not insistent upon making profits, but he does want to be allowed to make ends meet and stay in business so that he may do his part in the production of food to win this war, because he knows as no other group knows that men cannot be trained to be farmers in 2 or 3 months as the case may be in training skilled laborers in factories.

Under date of January 7, 1943, I have this letter from the C. A. Hawkins ranch, Fresno, Calif. This is a copy of a letter that was addressed to the Honorable SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Member of the Senate:

In compliance with your request at the Fresno farm meeting that I put my arguments about our debts and food supply in writing:

The simple fact is that already too many farm laborers have been removed from farms for it to be possible to maintain the food supply for men drawn into highly paid munition-factory jobs, our 10,000,000 men under arms, the army of Government bureaucrats, our civilian population, and meet our lend-lease commitments for food.

From the Louisiana Department of Agriculture, in a letter dated February 17, 1943, addressed to Hon. J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner of agriculture, Charleston, W. Va., I read:

I have just returned from a trip to north Louisiana and I find less farm work being done at present than at any time as far as I can remember. The help is just not available and farms will not work themselves.

From the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture, a letter dated February 16, 1943, I read as follows:

First, I would like to say that the farmers of America are willing and anxious to fulfill production goals 100-percent plus. In Arizona and the entire Southwest it is possible that 1943 agricultural production will exceed that of 1942.

I regret to state, however, that, in my opinion, our probable production will not exceed 80 percent of last year's, unless we have assurance within the next 60 days of sufficient labor, materials, and supplies, and repair parts for machinery and equipment.

I read further from the same letter:

Labor manpower: Manpower is the key to 1943 goals. Since Mr. McNutt's order of January 26, giving Secretary Wickard control of farm labor, we have hopes of prompt solution. Immediate action on following matters should eliminate our labor shortage:

(a) Draft deferment to all essential farm workers. Definite orders should be issued as most local and State selective-service boards ignore Director Hershey's suggestions in release No. 175, which was issued January 16. Essential men are still being called.

Here is a letter from the State of Idaho Department of Agriculture, addressed to Hon. J. H. BANKHEAD, United States Senate, Washington, dated February 6, 1943:

I have been in constant contact with the farmers in this State. I'm very familiar with their problems. The information I give you has been gained by actual experience.

I read further:

I know that the last few years, and especially last year, the farmers have not received an even break with other industries. I also know that if food is to be produced to feed our armed forces, our allies, and ourselves some drastic changes must be made and made immediately. Action must be taken.

Another paragraph from that letter reads:

Labor: Labor was an important factor in 1942, and is going to be more serious this year. Statistics show 400,000 farm laborers left the farm in 1942, many of them since harvest was completed. To produce more foodstuffs with less labor, when we were very short last year, is out of the question. We must get this help back. We haven't anything yet to offer to induce them to come back. We cannot compete with war industries, with wages. If these men are even drafted back on the farm, I don't believe they will be much help because of the high wages and short hours they have been working, they will be unwilling to work farmer hours. The only chance I see of getting them back is if food gets short and too hard to get in some of these crowded centers. Then they may come back on the farm to get something to eat.

This is from the National Grange:

Winning the war is our supreme task and to this accomplishment the Grange pledges

its maximum resources, both as an organization and through the individual efforts of its entire membership.

The attainment of this goal requires immediate action to assure farmers manpower, machinery, and supplies, with prices for food produced that will give farmers a reasonable financial return for their toil, compared with like effort in other essential industries.

Now I quote from a resolution adopted at the forty-sixth annual convention of the American National Live Stock Association held at Denver, Colo., January 15-16, 1943:

Whereas agricultural workers are being pirated by industry; and

Whereas some local draft boards do not give enough consideration to directions from selective service; and

Whereas the shortage of manpower for agriculture is curtailing the food production program: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American National Live Stock Association in annual convention in Denver, Colo., January 15-16, 1943, That we urge the War Manpower Commission to provide more effective control of pirating of agricultural workers by industry, and that selective service provide mandatory deferment of agricultural workers.

I should like to read an excerpt from an address by Albert S. Goss before the seventy-sixth annual session of the National Grange at Wenatchee, Wash., November 11, 1942:

As a result of this drain—

Speaking of the drain of manpower—farm production has suffered severely in some areas, and there is a great deal of evidence that plantings for next year will be shortly curtailed.

When he spoke of next year he meant this year, 1943, for he was speaking in November of last year.

Dairy cows have gone to the slaughter block in alarming numbers, while farm sell-outs have been breaking all records. Although the grange has been warning the administration and Congress of this for many months, until recently our warnings have been ignored and we have been blindly plunging into a situation which can result in no other way than a food shortage.

This morning I clipped from the Washington Times-Herald an article appearing on the front page headed—

The auction block—costs, labor shortage, force another dairyman to sell out.

The article proceeds to relate that a dairy close to Washington has been placed upon the block for sale, and says that it is one of three which in the last few months have been sold and closed out in the milk shed of this area.

Mr. President, I submit to the Senate that there is going to be less planted and less harvested in 1943 than was harvested in 1942. That fact is undeniable, based upon all the evidence that has been produced thus far on the question of manpower and production.

I deem it unnecessary further to quote authority and opinions upon this subject. Today every man and every woman in this country knows that there is a scarcity of food. If this were not true then why were we placed upon a rationing basis? Why are our people required to purchase food in limited quantities? Why the limitation upon the supplies which our people may have for subsist-

ence? Why the empty shelves and showcases of the food merchants?

I have no opposition to necessary rationing designed to insure a lasting supply of food to all our people, but I say that the very fact that we have resorted to rationing is proof sufficient of either an existing food shortage or an apprehension that there will be such a shortage. In either event, the situation is too serious for palliation on the part of Congress.

Facing a food shortage, on the other hand, our need for food supplies in this year will greatly exceed the demands of 1941.

Our armed forces are increasing in number. More and more of them are being sent across the seas to be maintained thousands of miles from home. Naturally this requires a greater outlay of food for those men, who, above all others, must have first call upon the food and agricultural products of this country.

In the report of Mr. Stettinius on the lend-lease program under which we sent these products to the other countries fighting this war with us, we are told that lend-lease shipments of foodstuffs must be increased over the shipments of 1942. That is a definite program requiring greater supplies of agriculture products, a program which even now is in process of performance.

We cannot ignore our own people here at home. We are not going to permit them to go hungry if we can prevent it; yet we must realize that the boys whom we have placed under arms and sent out upon the waters and to lands on other continents must receive food and supplies in sufficient quantities to maintain them first above all others.

The need, the crisis, is immediate. When we deal with the raising of crops we cannot await the convenience of Congress to pass a general manpower act, because crops grow in season. The time for planting is at hand now. Action must be taken at once on this subject or it must be forgotten for 1943. I for one am not willing that it shall be forgotten, and I for one realize the necessity for immediate action, even drastic action, if you please, in order to assure the raising of crops and the furnishing, as best we can, of the men necessary for that purpose. A crop shortage in 1943, with the immense feeding program we have undertaken, would place us in a dangerous position. It might bring disaster. Men with empty stomachs cannot fight; and a hungry people cannot be a strong people.

It is true that the measure before us will not reach out and bring back to the farms those who have left them, but at least it will prevent further depletion of the farm workers. I believe it will prevent their going to the manufacturing plants; if they leave the farm they will be subject to the Selective Service Act, as not necessarily being engaged in some essential industry; and it will stop them from entering the armed forces. Certainly, it is no answer to the existing shortage of farm labor that the military should continue to take men from the farms.

We cannot wait for a general and complicated manpower plan if we are to have sufficient crops in 1943. The seasons of

the year—the seasons of planting and growth and harvesting—do not await the deliberations of Congress. Nature will not await congressional action. This is so even though, as I am told, one of our bureaucrats suggested that lambing time be postponed although the lambs were on the way. Even the genius of the bureaus cannot bring about so great a miracle. But, nevertheless, the boys of the bureaus directed it be done.

It is my hope that the Bankhead substitute will be adopted by the Senate because it will attain the prime objective desired, regardless of what its critics may consider to be faults. It will keep on the farm the men who are now there.

The amendment which has been offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] does no more in effect than to reenact the existing law on this subject. It does no more than to reenact section 5, subsection K, of the present Selective Service Act. I invite attention to the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. He would exempt those engaged in any agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort. That sounds good when we read it. It is the same as, or quite similar to, the language of the present section of the Selective Service Act dealing with this subject and under which there has been complete failure. The present act on the subject is called the Tydings amendment. I do not doubt for one moment the earnestness and sincerity of purpose of the distinguished author of that amendment, or of the Congress in passing it, when it said that necessary farm workers who were essential were to be deferred. But what, in fact, has been the result? The administrators of the Selective Service Act seized upon the words "necessary" and "essential" and have set up their own definition as to who are necessary. In so doing they have defeated the very purpose of the act.

I point out that in the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming he has followed virtually that same language. It is attractive language. The words "necessary" and "essential" catch the eye at once; but when we look at the existing law we find the same words there. When we consider the situation throughout the country we find that in the interpretation of those words there has been a complete failure in the matter of keeping men on the farms.

The administrators of the act set up the so-called unit system now in use. First, they required that a farmer produce 16 units before there could be deferment, and the men from the farms continued to be taken into the service. The Selective Service department recognized its mistake and then set up an 8-unit basis, and that rule is in effect today as a basis for deferring essential farm workers. Mr. President, you and I know, as does everyone else who comes from a farming section, that today workers are still being taken from the farms. So it becomes necessary in this situation for the Congress in acting to be very definite and direct in order to accomplish the purpose of keeping men on the farms if food is to be produced. To do that we cannot use adjectives or quali-

fying terms, however appealing they may sound, because a trial has proved that they will not be interpreted as it was intended they should be interpreted by those who enacted the law.

The present section 5 (K) and the results under it represent another instance of the Congress enacting a law with the intent that it should accomplish a definite purpose and leaving words in the act to be defined by an administrative department which was not in sympathy with its provisions, with the result that methods of enforcement were set up which destroyed the very purpose of the law.

I submit that the time has come when the Congress, in enacting laws, must be definite when it gives to the administrative departments a duty to be performed. The O'Mahoney amendment contains in essence the same language as that of the present law, which has been a failure. To enact it would be purposeless. The O'Mahoney amendment goes a little further. The existing law does not recognize the creation of any unit system for determining who is a necessary worker, but the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would put a proviso into the law recognizing and placing in effect a unit system, and affirming and declaring that what is going on is right. For that reason I take issue with the distinguished Senator upon his amendment.

Mr. President, we are told that some 350,000 men have been deferred under the Tydings amendment to the present act. Yet, in the face of that, we have the statements of farmers and farm agents that needed farm workers continue to be taken. In fact, we know that even today they are being taken by local draft boards. Consequently it becomes necessary for us to be definite and say that in this perilous situation no farm worker who will stay on the farm and perform his work shall be taken into the military service.

At this time let me briefly address myself to the objections which have been made in the minority views to the bill as reported, and to certain questions which were raised on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

First. It is said that this is a blanket deferment of all persons working on the farm. That is correct. That has become necessary in order to preserve farm labor. The Selective Service Administrators, when given power to define such words as "essential" and "necessary" as they appear in the present law, and as they appear in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, set up for themselves their own definitions and proceeded to take needed workers from the farm. I have already dwelt upon this subject.

Second. Objection is made, also, that the enactment of the bill would be an invitation to anyone who might desire to evade service to go to the farms and work. It is my view that this objection has very little practical soundness in it, because when we use the words "worker on a farm" we mean a bona fide worker; that is, a farm hand or a farmer. We know that he goes there to work. We do

not have to write in the words "bona fide," "earnest," or "real" worker. There is not a draft board, and certainly there is not a community in this country, that would permit anyone to use such a law as a shield to avoid military service. His pretense would be revealed so quickly that no farm could hide him or keep him. When I say "farm worker" I mean just what that language implies—one who is truthfully a worker on a farm, or one who in truth operates a farm. I submit that it is only to beg the question, and that it is not a serious objection, to say that such a law would be a shield for a man to evade military service. If he goes to the farm and works and is a real farm worker, he is needed there; and we must boldly face the question and solve it as best we can.

It has been said that the so-called Tydings amendment, which is now in the law as section 5, subsection (k) of the Selective Service Act, is all that is necessary to keep the farm worker on the farm. We have discussed that question. I think it answers itself, by reason of the very fact that while that law has been in existence the farms have been denuded of their labor, until a food shortage is now upon us.

The argument is made that to exempt farm labor would be to undermine military morale. A Senator spoke of that yesterday. In support of this complaint there is cited the opposition to the bill of Mr. Patterson, Acting Secretary of War, General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, who is the one who set up the plan for enforcing the Tydings amendment in such a way as to destroy its effect, and Mr. Byrnes, of the Office of Economic Stabilization. I invite particular attention to the letter of Director of Economic Stabilization Byrnes, which is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. It reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1943.
Hon. R. R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military
Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: This is in reply to your two letters of February 19, 1943, with reference to S. 729 and S. 730.

The production of foods and fibers necessary for the war requires that some plan be worked out to secure the deferment of qualified laborers who are engaged in the production of essential war products until such time as adequate replacements can be provided. The necessary details, however, must be recommended by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who is primarily responsible for dealing with this problem, and who is in a position to estimate adequately the requirements of the armed forces and to industry, as well as agriculture.

I also agree that it will be necessary in certain cases of critical emergency, to furnish members of the armed forces for the harvesting of critical agricultural crops. The details of the plan, however, must be worked out in close cooperation with the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the Secretary of War, in order that no steps shall be taken which will disrupt the efficiency of our armed forces.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES, Director.

Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill which would call for any soldier coming back out of the ranks, or any sailor coming back from the Navy to the farm, so there would be no disruption on that score. The whole purport of the letter is that the plan must be worked out with the Manpower Commissioner and the Secretary of War. But the trouble is that we cannot work out any plan of this kind because no plan has been given the Manpower Commissioner, and none has yet been brought forth from any source under which the Commissioner was to operate. We cannot wait for that if we are to have sufficient crops in 1943.

With respect to these objections offered from persons in the War Department and the Selective Service Administration let me say, as a Member of this body, that no one will more wholeheartedly support the military in time of war than will I. That I intend to do. But I realize, as all other Senators must, that the military is principally interested in raising and equipping a sound army. That is, of course, essential. The Congress has the over-all duty not only to aid in raising such an armed force but to see to it that it is fed, and, furthermore, to see that the people of our country, the families from whom the men are taken, are fed and clothed. We have that duty as well as the duty of raising an army to fight the battles of this country.

If in its great work—which has been magnificent to this day—the military in the opinion of Congress has overlooked or is overlooking some necessary phase of this great war effort, such as the producing of food and other necessary farm crops, then it is the duty of Congress as the direct representative of the people, and under its over-all duty of supervision of government in time of war as well as in time of peace, to see to it that the threatened danger of lack of food is met and removed. That, of course, means keeping men on the farms. That means, in the present instance, that all men there at present must be kept there for the 1943 crop, because their ranks have now been thinned to the danger point.

Certainly it is no answer, referring to a point which was raised yesterday, to say that it is too late to pass this proposed law. It is never too late to save what we have left. If in order to help produce the food required by our country it is necessary that we take definite, even drastic, action to freeze men on the farms, to induce them to stay there, to provide under the edict of law that they shall stay there, then we must be courageous enough to take action sufficiently definite to meet the needs of the situation.

On the question of morale, I heard it said that the boys in the armed service would resent the deferment of men back here at home. I do not agree with that conclusion when the men under arms realize that such deferment is made for the purpose of raising food, not only for them but for the loved ones they left back home and whom they expect the Government of this country to protect while they are away. The man in the fighting forces is a sensible man. We

hear talk about morale. I can think of nothing that would destroy a soldier's morale so quickly or place him in greater distress than to know, or even believe, that his Government had failed him in not providing the essentials of life—such as food and clothing—for his family that he left back in America. I can take no stock in the argument of the opposition on that point.

On the same point let me read a short letter which I received under date of March 3—only last week—from a man serving in our armed forces. The letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES NAVAL FLIGHT
PREPARATORY SCHOOL,
Murray, Ky., March 3, 1943.

Congratulations upon your vote, noted in the press today in favor of the bill granting deferment to farm workers. This should have been done systematically long ago. It would have obviated the serious shortage of skilled farm labor and the dislocation in the farm communities, and would make unnecessary the absurd suggestions now heard to have doctors, lawyers, and bankers harvest the crops and to sprinkle interned Japanese around through the farms to help with the work. I have asked a number of my farmer friends what they think of these solutions. You know the answer. It's unanimous.

The sailor who wrote that letter is not a farmer. He came from city life. He knows the necessity for adequate farm labor. I believe that in his letter he expresses the feeling which all our soldiers will have when they realize that the action taken in that direction is for their benefit and for the benefit of their families.

So far as the fighting man is concerned, I give second place to no one in my determination to stand by him in seeing to it that he receives the first consideration of his country. But it is one thing to make declarations of devotion and to rest supinely upon such declarations, and yet another thing to back them up with positive, practical action that will assure our fighting men genuine support and sustenance.

Finally, Mr. President, if the farms shall continue to be denuded of their labor, who will work the land? Are we going to bring in foreign labor through the gates of immigration? Is the Federal Government going to help create in this land a situation whereby the boys of America will be upon the high seas and foreign shores fighting this World War, while the fields and farms back home will be cultivated by foreign men?

We hear talk about the question of morale. How is the soldier or the sailor going to feel about a situation of that kind, Mr. President?

I am not referring to something that is remote. If there shall be taken from the producing farms of this country the American men who live upon them and know the work, necessarily there will be created a dearth of workers there, and there will ensue a situation that will permit those who want the bars of immigration let down to say that it has become necessary to bring in foreign workers. I am opposed to having that done, and I am against creating any situation which might give any basis to the claim of need by those who would let down the bars of immigration. I

want to have the farms of this country maintained by American people.

Mr. President, the danger to which I have referred is not so remote. Let me remind the Senate that no later than December the Chief Executive asked the Congress to give him authority to control immigration into this country. It was not stated why that power was wanted, so far as I know. Could it have been that there was a desire to let in refugees under a plea that their labor was needed? Can it be that we shall create so difficult a situation on the farms of this country that such a request can be given the semblance of justification?

For my part, I shall oppose with all the power that I have the opening of the gates of this country to the foreign worker. When the millions of young men whom we have taken from the farms, from the shops, and from their homes are out fighting their country's battles, to my mind nothing that could happen to our national life could be more horrible than to have those of us who have undertaken to guide this country's course and to protect those we have sent to war allow the places of work to be filled by people from other lands, while our own sons are away fighting for our country's existence as a Nation. To them—to those boys of ours—we owe the first duty to see to it that the places of work are open to them when they come marching home, that this country is kept for them, and that our farms are maintained by Americans.

The danger is not so remote. Let me point out a question and an answer of a date no later than March 2, 1943, at one of the hearings on manpower. The answer was given by a military officer during the manpower inquiries now going. The question is as follows:

Colonel, if there is a shortage of labor on the farms, do you favor the importation of persons from other countries to work on the farms?

Here is the answer:

As a temporary expedient, yes, sir; until we get our agriculture properly organized.

"Until we get our agriculture properly organized!" What would we do with the foreign workers when it was organized? I want agriculture organized, and kept organized, with our American people. All of us know as a practical matter that we cannot ship foreign workers out of this country, once we bring them here.

I realize that the statement of one officer, giving his own opinion—and a very fair and candid opinion—does not necessarily reflect the views of others in the military service or on the administrative side of the Government; but summing up all of these things, I submit that it is the duty of Congress—and to no other body may we turn for the performance of that duty—to see to it that no one creates in this country such a situation as will give anyone any basis for stating that we need people from other countries in order to operate our farms.

To the proposal that farm workers be deferred from service in the armed forces, the objection has been raised that legislation to accomplish that result would be class legislation. Even if that

be so, I am willing to legislate with respect to a class in time of war, as a temporary measure, if such action be necessary to the winning of the war and to sustaining this country in its strength. If it be necessary to legislate with respect to one group of persons in order to assure to this country the needed food and other agricultural products, and to assure that the farms of this country are operated by our own people, then such legislation should be enacted.

But the measure is not class legislation in the sense in which that term is usually applied. What we seek to do would not be done for the benefit of the farmer or the farm worker. I rather suspect that many farmers will resent this measure. They may do so when the time comes for them to respond to the call of the Nation.

No doubt, in many instances, they may resent this law. What we do is done for all of America. It is done for the fighting forces of this country in order that they may be sustained in food and clothing. It is done so that all people living under our Government and looking to it for protection, as they have a right to do, shall be able to obtain the necessities of life.

The argument has been advanced that if we provide for deferment of the farm worker, we may be asked to do the same thing for workers in other lines of endeavor. That, of course, is but an argument of convenience. We have not been asked to defer any other class of workers, and, so far as I know, there is no need for such legislation. There is now in process of evolution an over-all organization of the workers of the country. I do not know what will come out of it; but at the present time no one has greater need for such an organization than does the farm worker. As I say, the question before us involves consideration of seasons and of planting times. A shortage of crops in 1943 may be a disaster.

There is another fact which bears on the situation. The man who is needed in the plant usually gets his deferment through the application of his employer; the man on the railroad and in the mine, when needed in that work, has the voice of his employer saying that he is needed there. But the farm worker, has in many instances, no employer to make such a request for him. Under the present law deferment for the farmer must usually come through the request of his father or from the worker on his own farm unsustained by other requests. The application for deferment, in the first place, is not very strong when a father asks for his own boy's deferment, and, in the second place, if it is granted under such circumstances, the odium of a slacker is placed upon the boy and he lives in his community shunned by his neighbors around him. The law now proposed requires that he be kept on the farm to perform agricultural work in the service of his country and that a certificate be issued showing that fact. In other words, the law would say to him, "You stay on the farm, you are not asking for deferment, but your Government wants you to stay there, and when you do you will be given a certificate, which you may show to the world, that you are deferred under the order of your Government and not at your own request."

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the Bankhead substitute. I urge it for the men who are fighting the war of their country. I urge it in the name of those they have left at home in our hands for protection, for the whole general populace that must be fed and clothed. I urge it for a secure America which must continue to have Americans operate its farms and plants, which must be safeguarded against the floods of immigration. We must never create such a situation that while our own blood, our own boys, will be fighting the battles of the world on foreign shores men of other countries, aliens, will be operating the farms within our own country. May such a thing never happen in America.

Mr. President, I submit that the Bankhead amendment would more nearly achieve the desired purpose than would the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I further submit that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming would simply be the reenactment of the present law which has been a failure. It would, indeed, go further than that, for it would write into the law the plan brought forth by the Selective Service Board which has failed to keep men on the farm.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in its practical effect, the Bankhead amendment is an amendment to increase the number of and to hasten the drafting of married men with children. That proposition is intermingled with the Bankhead amendment as it will be applied by the Government.

The debate on this question has been very interesting. I think one of the most logical deductions was that drawn by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], that the whole philosophy of the drafting of citizens in time of war was started wrong and needs to be revised in the light of the failures and inequalities which have followed in its wake.

There are two proposals before the Senate. The first is to blanket in and exempt from military service all persons working on farms. The other proposal, in essence, is to make the question of deferment an individual question predicated upon the character of the work, the irreplaceability of the worker, and the necessity of the Nation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I prefer not to yield until I can develop the argument a little further.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell long on the two amendments, because I am advised that the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] intends to discuss them in their details. So I will pass them over for the moment.

I inquire now, Where are we going to get the Army which we are told by the military experts is essential in order to fight this war? If Congress wants to cut down the size of the Army, the way to cut it down is by law. If Congress does not want to cut down the size of the Army, then it should be drawn from all walks of life. Insofar as the Nation's needs

will permit, there ought to be an equality in sacrifice in the raising of the Army, because no one in this country is going to perform any service whatsoever which will reasonably compare with the service of the men in the armed forces.

We already know what service in the armed forces means. It means, in many cases, the giving up of life itself and in other cases the bearing of wounds by the young men of our Nation. So, if we cut anywhere and exempt in a blanket fashion a great group of American citizens, we have to go elsewhere, into the ranks of the married men with children, in order to get the men to replace those who have been excluded. It cannot successfully be denied that that will be the case if the Bankhead amendment shall be adopted.

First of all, what is the trouble? Is it that the military forces are depleting the farms of workers? No; that is not the trouble, for the testimony before various committees shows that 70 percent of the farm depletion went into industry. I do not blame the farm workers for going into industry, for the following very proper reasons: Mr. President, what do you suppose the average farm weekly wage is in this country? I have before me the figures for every State in the Union, with board and without board, for 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942. Listen. For the Nation, as a whole, in 1939 the average was \$27.39 a month with board, and \$35.82 without board.

In 1940 the average was \$28.08 a month with board, and \$36.68 without board a month.

In 1941, the average was \$34.85 a month with board, and \$43.64 a month without board.

In 1942 the average was \$46.64 a month with board, and \$56.07 a month without board.

In other words, the average wage, even in 1942, was less than \$2 a day. There is the problem, Senators.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. The figures stated by the Senator, as I understand, constitute the average for the United States as a whole?

Mr. TYDINGS. The figures given represent the average for the whole country, but I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a table showing the wages, with and without board, for each State in the Union. I believe the wages are highest in California, where a shortage of labor has been occasioned by the transfer to camps of large numbers of Japanese, who formerly worked on the farms, and lowest in some of the Southern States where in some instances wages are but half as much as the average which I read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Without objection, the table may be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

Annual average wage rates, 1939-42, per month, by States, and United States

[Straight average of 4 quarters—not official estimates of annual averages]

State	1939		1940		1941		1942	
	With board	Without board	With board	Without board	With board	Without board	With board	Without board
Maine	\$30.10	\$45.70	\$30.60	\$48.60	\$38.20	\$58.30	\$51.60	\$74.80
New Hampshire	31.70	54.80	31.90	55.30	35.80	61.40	49.20	77.70
Vermont	30.20	47.60	31.30	48.10	38.50	58.10	50.00	72.10
Massachusetts	32.30	61.50	33.60	62.80	39.40	70.80	53.60	89.10
Rhode Island	38.10	65.40	36.00	64.50	45.80	73.10	55.60	89.60
Connecticut	34.80	63.60	35.70	63.10	45.20	73.60	56.80	89.00
New York	29.80	45.50	30.70	46.80	38.40	56.20	50.30	72.00
New Jersey	32.00	53.60	33.10	54.60	39.10	62.50	51.10	77.60
Pennsylvania	26.40	41.70	27.10	42.20	31.40	47.80	38.50	60.80
Ohio	26.20	38.80	26.30	39.00	31.60	44.60	39.30	55.40
Indiana	27.10	37.60	27.70	38.60	32.80	44.30	40.90	54.60
Illinois	31.80	42.60	32.20	42.90	38.30	49.10	48.10	61.40
Michigan	27.40	41.90	28.20	42.10	35.40	51.10	44.30	63.20
Wisconsin	28.10	41.10	28.00	41.90	36.70	51.30	48.90	67.40
Minnesota	28.60	40.80	28.60	40.70	34.90	47.90	48.50	63.90
Iowa	31.70	41.40	32.10	42.10	38.30	48.10	52.10	63.80
Missouri	22.60	31.10	23.20	31.80	26.70	36.40	34.90	46.40
North Dakota	25.80	39.10	26.40	39.60	34.00	48.80	50.50	68.70
South Dakota	26.70	38.90	27.10	39.60	33.20	46.50	48.20	64.00
Nebraska	24.80	34.90	25.80	36.10	31.00	41.90	45.30	58.60
Kansas	24.00	35.30	24.50	35.90	29.60	41.80	41.20	57.40
Delaware	24.40	37.40	26.10	39.20	31.40	45.10	39.10	56.60
Maryland	26.50	38.50	27.10	39.70	31.60	45.20	38.30	54.70
Virginia	21.30	30.40	21.80	30.90	24.90	35.10	30.60	44.40
West Virginia	21.60	31.90	22.00	32.40	24.50	35.30	30.20	43.90
North Carolina	17.00	24.90	17.40	25.40	19.80	28.20	25.80	35.50
South Carolina	12.30	18.10	12.90	18.70	14.20	20.70	18.70	25.90
Georgia	12.20	17.90	12.80	18.60	14.80	20.90	18.80	26.00
Florida	15.60	26.80	15.90	27.80	18.40	31.20	25.10	41.90
Kentucky	20.40	28.90	20.20	28.60	23.10	31.80	29.10	39.90
Tennessee	16.50	23.90	16.90	24.20	19.60	27.60	24.30	34.00
Alabama	13.60	19.40	13.60	19.50	15.80	22.00	21.60	29.80
Mississippi	14.20	20.50	14.20	20.70	15.90	22.80	20.40	28.50
Arkansas	15.10	23.50	16.20	23.90	19.00	27.00	25.40	36.20
Louisiana	15.10	22.80	15.50	23.00	16.90	24.50	21.90	30.50
Oklahoma	20.20	29.60	20.80	30.20	24.30	34.40	33.00	45.60
Texas	20.60	29.50	21.10	30.10	25.10	34.40	34.70	46.30
Montana	37.10	53.20	38.80	54.80	44.70	63.90	63.30	84.20
Idaho	37.40	52.20	38.60	53.70	45.70	60.80	63.40	83.30
Wyoming	35.70	52.10	36.30	52.80	43.70	59.30	58.10	77.30
Colorado	29.50	45.40	30.30	45.90	35.60	51.40	48.10	68.70
New Mexico	27.60	42.20	27.90	40.20	32.10	45.70	42.40	57.70
Arizona	38.20	54.60	36.40	55.30	42.20	59.30	60.80	80.60
Utah	42.10	55.90	44.40	58.60	48.60	66.20	68.60	87.80
Nevada	40.60	60.30	42.40	58.70	46.60	69.30	59.00	82.10
Washington	35.80	53.20	37.00	56.90	45.10	67.20	69.00	97.80
Oregon	35.30	52.20	35.80	53.80	44.90	63.30	68.80	92.90
California	45.90	69.30	45.60	72.10	55.60	81.20	76.60	105.70
United States	27.39	35.82	28.05	36.68	34.85	43.64	46.64	56.07

United States rates are official annual averages: Weighted by hired farm labor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, by the Bankhead amendment we are not going to keep workers on the farms unless we propose to compel them to work for \$56.07 a month, when men are getting an average of \$158 a month in the war industries of the Nation for working 8 hours a day, are getting time and a half for overtime, and double time if they work 7 days in a week and the seventh day is on Sunday, and are also receiving social-security benefits, unemployment pay, and retirement pay thrown in.

Mr. President, there is the issue. Why not face it? The adoption of the Bankhead amendment will not cure that situation unless it says to farm workers, "Go to work on the farm for this wage even though your neighbor is making three times as much and working shorter hours in the war plants of the Nation."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Maryland the date of the figures he has given.

Mr. TYDINGS. I obtained them 4 or 5 days ago.

Mr. BYRD. What was the date when they were effective in the industries and on the farms?

Mr. TYDINGS. I gave the dates, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, the wages have been somewhat increased.

Mr. TYDINGS. They have been going up each year, but even with the increase the average in 1942 was \$56.07 a month, out of which a man must provide food, clothing, and shelter for himself and his family.

Some may think men will be held on the farms in the face of such a disparity between industrial and agricultural wages. If they are, I do not know human nature. The only people left on the farms are those who have remained because the farmers have raised the pay in order to hold them, those who love to farm, those who find that farming is what they like to do best.

Mr. President, who is the farmer about whom I am talking? We are looking to that farmer in our own homes today and tomorrow for breakfast, for dinner and for supper. We are looking to him for the clothes on our backs, whether they be cotton or wool, for the hides which make the shoes on our feet, and for the lumber in all our homes. He is the one who furnishes all these things. He is creating all the wealth on which all war industries and all industrial wages depend, and in the midst of the highest wages in all history he is getting \$56.07 a month for contributing the things without which we could not run the Nation's plants, or even an Army, or fight a war.

I know that for a long time farmers were blinded by the fact that they received a yearly check, paid to them from money borrowed by the Government in an effort to even up things. Now the chickens are coming home to roost. That is why the farms have been depleted. The military services have gotten only 30 percent of the men who have left the farms. The industrial plants have gotten 70 percent.

Then think of what will happen if we freeze men on the farms, as the Bankhead amendment would do, since under it they could not leave the farms until they went to some civilian tribunal and said, "I do not want to work for \$33 a month, or for \$40 a month, or \$56.07 a month"—which is the average for the whole country. "I can go down the road and get \$158 a month." "Ah, but you cannot do that. You must stay on your farm."

That is what the Bankhead amendment would accomplish. Of course, that would be nothing more nor less than bringing about a condition of enforced labor; it would result in nothing more nor less than slavery. If we are going to enter upon such a movement, let us make a law for the entire country, and require everyone to share the sacrifices, and not condemn to slavery the poorest paid workers in the whole economic scale, while all the others in the economic picture do pretty much as they please.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope that before he concludes the Senator will give us his solution. I am not asking for the activities he would suggest in carrying it out, but I should like to have his program for increasing wages on the farms and earnings on the farms to a point which would be sufficiently attractive to make farmers desire to stay on the farms.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's question is a good one, and I shall come to it in due time.

Mr. President, the farmer of this Nation, and particularly the farm worker, has been the real forgotten man during the last 20 years. The whole economic system has been set up with no consideration whatever for the farmer. The farmer pays, in direct and indirect taxes, his share of the social-security program, of unemployment insurance, and old-age taxes, but he gets none of it for himself.

The farmer, through his taxes, will pay off the huge debt which this Government is going to drive up perhaps to the \$250,000,000,000 mark, to pay all the high wages now being drawn, and to pay all the manufacturers the billions of dollars they receive under contracts. The farmer gets none of it.

Every time the prices of manufactured articles increase, either because of wage increases or through social-security payments which are added to the cost of the articles, the farmer's income is correspondingly depressed.

We cannot raise wages on the farm without increasing the cost of food and clothing and shelter. It is not possible. But why should it not be done?

When we increase the cost of manufactured articles, we depress the income of every farmer and farm worker in this country; and that has been taking place for a long time. Politicians travel about the country and tell what stanch friends they are to a particular group, and the great gains which have been made, but they fail to tell the remaining groups that the gains were made quite often at their expense. People have been falling for that boloney, one group

being put up on stilts at the expense of another group which is already away down, right on the bottom.

It is not possible to increase the cost of manufactured articles, as a result of increased wages, without passing the increase on to the farmer and to the other consumers of the country. It is not possible to increase the cost of food because of the necessity of raising wages without increasing the cost of living.

Let us put ourselves in the farm worker's position. There he is on the farm, working 10 hours a day, 7 days a week, without any overtime pay, with no social security benefits, without the benefit of retirement pay, and he is working for less than \$2 a day, when he can go right down the road and get \$158 a month, which is the average, work 8 hours a day, get time and a half for overtime on Saturday, if the industry operates under the 48-hour week system, and get unemployment insurance and old-age pensions thrown in.

Does anyone think we are going to hold workers on the farm unless we compel them to serve there through the medium of the Bankhead amendment? If we do that, if we force men to work on the farm and to stay on the farm, then justice has left this Chamber, and reason has departed from the meditations of those in it.

Mr. President, I stated at the beginning of my remarks that the Bankhead amendment, in its ramifications, though not so intended, I know, in practical effect is an amendment to compel, to increase the number of, and to hasten the drafting of married men with children, and I shall give the proof.

Mr. McNutt, General McNarney, Mr. Wickard, Mr. Donald Nelson, and 30 other witnesses testifying before the Bankhead subcommittee have all told of the need for labor. What is that need, in a paragraph?

Outside of the figures 4,300,000 needed for the Army and Navy this year, 6,400,000 entirely new workers must be found for service here at home. It is hoped to get 2,700,000 of these from the ranks of women, 500,000 from the physically handicapped, whose disabilities are so slight that they can be overcome. The remaining 3,200,000 can be obtained only by a reduction of employees in less essential industries. Let us stop there and call it by its right name. It means by putting out of business less essential industries, by not allowing them to stagger along, because when we take 3,200,000 from a nonessential industry we might as well put up a sign "Closed for the duration of the war." The figures I have given present the manpower picture and problem, and superimposed on all that is the need for 3,100,000 seasonal agricultural workers at harvest time, not regularly employed, not working on the farm steadily, but for a month, or 2 months, or 3 months at the outside.

What the Bankhead amendment would do would be to shove back into agriculture every one who lives on a farm, whether he milks one cow, two cows, three cows, or four cows; whether he works 6 hours a day, or 5 hours a day, or 3 hours a day, or 2 hours a day. Under the Bankhead amendment, a worker

would not have to be regularly employed; he would not have to be irreplaceable; he would only have to be there. Go over the Nation and tell the married men with one child, two children, three children, four, five, or six children, that because of this, though they would not have been called without it, perhaps, they must go and leave their families, to take the places of some other persons in the armed services of this country.

Let me say, Senators, this war is not yet over. Regardless of how much we may be advancing on any front, regardless of how great the drives, this war will be a long war, and the casualty lists are going to be large, just so surely as that we sit in the Senate Chamber. I should rather have almost anything else lying as a bar on my conscience than to know I had favored a piece of legislation which substituted some man who should not go, under the laws of right and reason, in the place of one who should have gone, in the place where we need him in this crucial time.

We are going to need men for the armed forces. We may not like the size of the Army or the Navy or the other armed forces, we may think it is not necessary to have such a number; but who knows? Even as I am speaking, a new situation may develop in some theater of war which will disabuse our minds of our preconceived ideas of what size the United States Army should be. The time to have thought of those things was before we got into the war. A country can get into a war very quickly. The only way I know of to get out of a war is to fight our way out of it, and win it.

When the time comes that the Nation is at war there is only one thing to do, and that is win it quickly.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, for whatever it may be worth, there could be no greater mistake made by us than not to give the Army and the Navy, within human reason, what they want in manpower; otherwise, in the long run, probably more lives will be lost, greater treasure squandered, and graver troubles and trials encountered than by making everything available to shorten this war, and to save life, and to get it over.

Therefore, I say that the Bankhead amendment, in its practical application, is a measure for the draft of married men with children. It means that, for everyone it excludes from the draft, if he is not needed, if he is not regularly employed, if he is not irreplaceable, someone else must take his place; and the figures show there are not enough single men now left to man the ramparts. So, if the Senators feel that they would rather eat bacon every day and send a married man with children to the slaughter, well and good. For my part, I would rather not eat bacon at all and keep that man in his home with his wife and children.

Mr. President, we hear talk about a food famine. There is not going to be any famine. You know it and I know it. There will not be as much food as we have been used to, not so many varieties as we have been accustomed to have.

We shall have a great deal more rationing than we have had up to now, but no one is going to starve. There will be enough to keep us going, and if not, we will have to cease some of our shipments abroad, for first we are going to live without starving, and we can be assured that our boys overseas are going to live, too. We will give away only what we can spare by sacrificing greatly. We are not going to give away food to the point where we starve to death. So do not be frightened. Of course, there will be a shortage of food.

Mr. President, I do not like comparisons with other countries, for I am not one of those who thought the problems of England or Russia or China were like the problems of the United States. But, by way of comparison in this instance, how many Senators know that the British people get two eggs apiece a month? They get very little meat. They have to eat food they can plant, such as cabbage and sprouts, and so on. We will not have to do that. We will eat more than two eggs a month, and we will eat a good bit of meat. That is far from starving.

Mr. President, I should rather eat less than the British eat, and do everything humanly within my power to shorten the war, to save the life of just one other boy, than I would to live well, and have life as usual, at the expense of the tears and the grief and the worry of some poor woman, or some poor children of some poor father, or some poor brother.

Mr. President, that is the question we are voting on here. We cannot put sacrifice on the basis of the belly while men die in filth in the South Pacific, suffer all kinds of tropical diseases, are killed in action on the battlefield, or suffer from wounds, with torn bodies in the hospitals.

In God's name, having raised this large Army, this Marine Corps, and this Navy, and set them into action by our formal edict, let us keep on sending enough to give them the fullest measure of support and devotion we humanly can. If we are not going to do that, then let us have a declaration of peace right here and now, and bring all the men back. Do not let us leave them over there with too few weapons and too few men to end the war as quickly as we can.

Briefly, Mr. President, the O'Mahoney amendment is realistic, humane, and just. What does it say in essence? I will not discuss it in detail, because the Senator from Wyoming will do so, but in essence it says that we need to consider food as a weapon; that we need to consider the raw materials produced on the farm for clothing and shelter and so forth as a weapon, and, just as in industry, where a man is regularly employed and irreplaceable, we cannot afford to have that line of supply stopped, and therefore the man on the farm should be exempt from military service because he is contributing the thing he can best contribute, and which he is working very long hours under difficult conditions to contribute.

Mr. President, I wish to go back for a moment to a discussion of what I think is the real effect of the amendment drawn by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. We all know that if 11,000,000 men are taken for the armed

forces it means the service of a representative from one out of every three families in America. Think of that; one out of every three families will have a man in the armed services, because there are roughly 33,000,000 or 34,000,000 families in this country. There will hardly be a street, or a country road, on which there is not a blue star in the window of every third house. If we cut down the availability of the men who are going into that army by saying that 5,000,000 families, for example, have no part in it, then we would correspondingly increase the number of homes on certain streets and roads from which substitutes must come to take the place of those who have been excluded. So what would we be doing if we adopted the amendment drawn by the Senator from Alabama? In a blanket fashion, without any reasonable yardstick of measurement, without any regard to the intrinsic merit of the effort made by a particular farmer, we would be shutting off behind the fence of safety those men as a group, and telling the rest of the Nation "Come forth to take their places in the battle line."

Let us consider the number of those who remain of the available single men in the country. There are not enough single men, Senators, to fill the ranks. Every time a single man is excluded in industry, or every time a single man is excluded on the farm, or in Government work, or in any other place, a married man is taken bodily away from his wife and children and substituted in the place of the man who is excluded. Is not that what the Bankhead amendment would do? Will that not be the effect of it, and do Senators want to have on their conscience the fact that they have excused a part-time worker, and to fill his place, have taken from another group a full-time worker who is constantly employed, and quite often he will be a man with children?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator please explain to us how the O'Mahoney amendment would save the married men?

Mr. TYDINGS. The O'Mahoney amendment confessedly, by the words out of my able friend's own mouth, purports to keep not all the men on the farm; it purports to keep only those, if it keeps any, who are regularly employed and who are irreplaceable. To the extent that it keeps them on the farm it makes the draft of married men inevitable to supplant that very number. But the amendment of the Senator from Alabama would add vastly to that number, without any regard to the Nation's need, and would make the draft of married men continually greater.

Mr. President, before I conclude answering the Senator's question, let me say that, while I hope it is not a prophecy, yet I have a feeling, if the Bankhead amendment shall be adopted, the very Senators who are sponsoring it will, in time, repudiate it on the floor of the Senate. Its injustice is so apparent, the lack of logic to support it is so evident,

and there is about it such a lack of what I call the commonness of sacrifice, that sooner or later events are going to catch up with it, when the married men learn that, because of blanket deferments on the farm, they are going to be summoned to the colors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then my understanding of the Senator's reply is, boiled down to a very few words, that the reason the O'Mahoney amendment protects married men is that it is less effective and less potent than the Bankhead amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no. Let me say to the Senator—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The O'Mahoney amendment does not say anything about married men, does it?

Mr. TYDINGS. There has been a good deal of loose talk with no facts to support it. For example, it is said that the Tydings amendment did not do any good. I got in touch with General Hershey several days ago and again yesterday. He said that the first 2 months the so-called Tydings amendment was on the books, 364,000 regularly employed and irreplaceable farm workers who were called for the draft were deferred. That was in just 2 months. I was informed only yesterday that more than 1,000,000 regularly employed and irreplaceable farm workers will be deferred under my amendment during 1943.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILLIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator referring to all men, or only to single men?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am referring to all men who were exempted because of the Tydings amendment, and not to the greater number who were exempted because of physical disabilities or dependents.

Mr. AIKEN. About 400,000 men will eventually be classified as II-C, and the rest will be classified as III-C. That means that they will be deferred for family as well as occupational reasons.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know what the difficulty has been. It has not been with the Tydings amendment, but with the Selective Service Act. A communication is forwarded to the draft officials of the State of Mississippi, for example, which is an agricultural State, or to the State of New Mexico, Arkansas, or Alabama, and the officials are told that, based upon population, their next quota will be so many men—we will say, for example, 30,000 men. In turn quotas are assigned to the various counties. In an agricultural county the draft board is bedeviled to obtain from the particular county the number of men it must have without taking some from the farms.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Tydings amendment has done a great deal of good.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. He was very helpful in having it adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I am not sure that it goes far enough. It certainly does not go so far as the Bankhead amendment goes; but it has done much good.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure of that. The amendment offered by my good friend the able Senator from Wyoming would write into the law the regulations which the Selective Service System has adopted to interpret and carry into effect the Tydings amendment so that they would become law and not merely regulations with which the draft boards are now confronted.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has said that the principal difficulty in administering the act has been in the competition of industry.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIS. Has the Senator from Maryland any information concerning the number of men who went into the Army, and the number who went into industry after they were deferred under the Tydings amendment? Did they leave the farms?

Mr. TYDINGS. They cannot be deferred unless they remain on the farm. When they accept employment from industry they can be drafted into military service unless they are irreplaceable in their then employment.

Mr. WILLIS. Would not that situation support the belief that under the new provision the men would remain on the farms?

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that since the amendment of November 13 of last year—commonly referred to by the author's name—was adopted, the whole tendency has been to arrest the trend from the farm to industry, and that the trend is now the other way. Why, I will not attempt to explain. Senators must draw their own conclusions. However, the fact is that the trend from the farms to industry has been stopped. Unfortunately, it was not stopped soon enough. The draft law considered all occupations on an equal footing.

This year, in round numbers, 400,000 men a month are being taken. General Hershey has told us that this year the draft will provide 4,300,000 men for the armed services. The men who went in this January will not be fully trained and equipped until next January. The men who go in next June—400,000 during that month—will not be fully trained and equipped until a year later. Those who go in next December will not be fully trained and equipped until December 1944. What does it add up to? It means that we shall not have 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, trained, equipped, and ready to fight until December 1944.

This morning I asked for figures pertaining to the Army as of December 31, 1942. According to the figures we had at that time 366,869 officers and 4,989,053 enlisted men, which, with eight-thousand-odd warrant officers, gives a total in the Army of 5,364,521 officers and enlisted men. That is roughly five and a third

million. Of those five and a third million a great many had not been in the Army longer than 6 months. Some had not been in the Army longer than 3 months. Some had been in the Army only 1 month, the month of December.

This war is not over by any means. Perhaps more men should have been isolationists than there were. Perhaps we should have had a different policy. I do not know. I am not questioning or arguing the philosophy of anyone. The point is that that day is past. We are in the war. We are not one-half in it, three-quarters, five-sixteenths, or ninety-nine one-hundredths in it. We are all the way in. Our boys are out on the firing line.

I do not know whether we are serving them by shoving certain groups into the cloakroom out of sight and throwing a greater burden upon those who remain, for the more who are shoved into the cloakroom out of sight, without regard to their morality, character, worthiness, or education, the lower the physical quality becomes. The greater the number is, the better the physical, moral, and mental stature of the individual soldier will be.

Let me mention another point: The Axis nations have 17,000,000 men under arms. When we bring our Army to full strength, and Britain does likewise, we shall not be quite up to the Axis strength in numbers, because we shall have fewer than 17,000,000 men. However, we shall supply the lack of men with tanks, planes, equipment, and other means which should—and I believe will—make us superior to our enemies and bring about their defeat.

Keep in mind that even when all these things take place our Army will not be so large as that of our combined foes. Our boys are over there. If we had three times as many in Africa as we have now Rommel would not last one-third the time; and even though we might have more men, we should not lose as many as we shall lose with fewer men. We could wind up the African campaign quickly and get busy somewhere else. The point is that by dragging it on and keeping a small army hamstrung, taking the conduct of the war out of the hands of the generals and admirals, we may unnecessarily waste human life, prolong the war, deplete the Treasury, and bring on chaos.

Mr. President, I have talked at great length. I think I have covered the essential things in my mind. I shall conclude with one or two observations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with much of what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said. I believe that his philosophy in relation to the Army is correct. However, it seems to me that the two amendments which have been proposed would probably arrive at the same result.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then why is the Senator in favor of the original proposal?

Mr. WILEY. Let me continue. Yesterday it was stated as authentic that practically all the available farm labor

has already gone "out of the stable," so to speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. In many places, that is true.

Mr. WILEY. And only 250,000 remain.

Mr. TYDINGS. Two hundred and fifty thousand what?

Mr. WILEY. Available single men on the farms. I should like to have the very fine mind of the Senator directed to this question: He said, for instance, that there was no danger of famine. I agree with him.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. But there is danger that we will not get all the food we wish.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can say to the Senator that we will not get it.

Mr. WILEY. There must be a way to get labor back to the farms. In Great Britain farms are operated almost exclusively by women, and they are doing a good job. We are talking about an issue which involves only 250,000 single men, a large proportion of whom the Senator agrees are essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the ramifications of the bill the Senator would draft 250,000 married men to take their places.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, no; the Senator does not understand my position.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator cannot escape the logic of it. Somewhere along the line, in obtaining an armed force of 11,000,000, 250,000 married men must furnish the quota which would otherwise be furnished by the single men. I am not saying that the single men should not be excluded for the purpose of the Senator's question.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Maryland; but I understand that under the O'Mahoney amendment, whether men are married or single, if they meet the test they remain on the farm.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILEY. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] asked how many men would be affected. If they are needed on the farms, they are essential, whether they are married or single. It is conceded that practically all men on the farm are essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. No one has the answer to that question. However, it may be said that if a man is regularly employed and is irreplaceable, he will stay on the farm.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming would, in effect, write into the law all the liberalizing regulations and policies which have been discussed, to give further emphasis to the protection which should be afforded the man who is regularly employed and irreplaceable.

The Bankhead amendment, in effect, would blanket out the farm group because they live on farms and are substantially employed there. The two things are entirely different. The original proposal would allow men to stay on the farms only when they could not be replaced. The Bankhead amendment would allow them to stay on the farms even though they be part-time workers.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; but the result would be the same if the men are all essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it would be the same. I did not follow the Senator's original question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin confuses the argument. He says "if they are essential."

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The distinction is so plain that I wonder why anybody should hesitate for 3 seconds over it. The substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which is the third or fourth substitute, is acknowledged by its proponents to be a blanket deferment. Under that amendment, men on the farms would be deferred whether they were individually contributing in sufficient quantity or not.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment which was suggested by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs avoids that great difficulty, and provides that no one shall be deferred unless he individually is making at least the minimum contribution to the production of an essential food.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, in essence the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming takes the regulations, which have been greatly liberalized, even down to eight cows a day, and writes them into the law. It does not change the Tydings amendment. It leaves it on the statute books, but explains how it shall be safeguarded by having interpretations thrown around it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator just said that the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado did not cover the point that the worker had to be essential on the farm and had to do work resulting in a certain amount of production needed for the war effort. It is my interpretation—and I believe it to be correct—that in order to obtain deferment a man must be essential on a farm. Under the O'Mahoney amendment, I am quite sure the man must remain essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. GURNEY. The point I want to make is that the men must remain essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. President, yesterday I asked General Hershey what he thought about the two amendments. I hold in my hand a letter from General Hershey stating what he thinks about them. Before I read his letter let me say that there never was a fairer group of men to deal with, in my opinion, on essential vocational problems than the group made up of General Hershey and the staff which he has about him. They have been willing to meet with us at any time. On several days we met in the office of the Senator from Alabama, and largely through the leadership of the Senator from Alabama we

obtained many liberalizing interpretations of the Tydings amendment, and General Hershey has been fully cooperating with us in endeavoring to keep irreplaceable and regularly employed laborers on the farms.

I read General Hershey's letter:

MARCH 10, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am submitting this statement in answer to your inquiry as to my views on the amendment by way of a substitute presented to the Senate yesterday by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.

As you know, I have already submitted a statement of my views on S. 729 as originally introduced and on a substitute therefor which was considered in committee and agreed to by the committee with some modifications. That statement is set forth following the minority report.

Although the Johnson substitute requires as a condition precedent to deferment that a registrant be engaged substantially full time in producing agricultural commodities, certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as essential, there is no requirement for any minimum quantity of production for each commodity, nor is there any requirement that the registrant must be irreplaceable, and by irreplaceable I mean that there is no satisfactory replacement ready and able to replace the registrant.

Without those two requirements, namely, irreplaceability and quantity of production, the Johnson substitute constitutes blanket deferment, and hence class legislation. It will in my opinion tend to remove the incentive for maximum production and will not be acceptable either to the public generally, to the registrants in other occupations, to the men already in the armed services and their families, or to the bona fide farmers themselves. I don't think real farmers want to be classified along with those whom the Johnson substitute would in my opinion place with them.

I trust this statement will satisfactorily answer your inquiry.

There you have it. The Senator from Alabama asked me what was to be done concerning the disparity which is occasioned by the low pay received by farm workers and the high pay received by industrial workers. Well, who sets the high wage scales of the industrial workers? Our Government is now setting most of them. It is causing their employment, and everything that the higher standard of wages finally reaches must in turn bring about similar high wages in other manufacturing enterprises. Otherwise, their labor would leave and would go where the highest wages were paid.

There is one way we can get at the problem, but we cannot get at it by passing a law. We must get at it by administration. That may not be advisable; I am not advocating it. I am answering the question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator what is his position?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will state it. My way would be to pay the men who work on the farms more money, and let the ceilings go up correspondingly, just as we have paid the men in the manufacturing plants more money, and the prices of all manufactured products have gone up and have been increased to the farmers and to all other consumers. I would give equality of justice to men who are producing equally. That is my solution.

I would go down to the O. P. A., if I could do so, and have it explain to the country that the farmers are entitled to every bit of consideration that the industrial workers are entitled to. We are not going to hold farm workers on the farms—I care not how many laws may be passed—until we rearrange the work and until we pay agricultural skill in line with what is paid to industrial skill. Seventy percent of the men who have left the farms have gone to industry. The Army has not raided the farms; it has taken only 30 percent of those who have left. No one will begrudge the farm workers all the wages and all the short hours and other benefits the farms will stand.

However, while industrial workers have gone up in their economic scale, farm workers have remained on the lowest scale. In many cases, the increases received by industrial workers have to some extent decreased the income of the farmers and of the farm workers. Therefore, my solution would be to pay the farm worker a decent wage, to add that wage to the cost of production of agricultural commodities, and to give justice to the farmer whose son is in the armed forces, just as we give justice to others in America whose sons are in the armed forces.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Scrugham
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Murdock	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has made such an excellent analysis of some of the fundamental reasons why the so-called Johnson amendment should not be adopted, that I shall endeavor to content myself with a brief effort to analyze the various proposals which are before the Senate. I should like to make

clear just what the issue is. In order to do that, I think it will be necessary, first, that there should appear in the RECORD, at the beginning of my remarks, the so-called Tydings amendment as it now reads in the Selective Service and Training Act as section 5 (k) of that act.

There being no objection, the so-called Tydings amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work:

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Following that, I should like to have appear in the RECORD the bill as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, Senate bill 729, which contains the text of the original Bankhead proposal stricken through and then the first alternative which was submitted by the majority.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 729) as introduced and as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., [That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“(k) Every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor or whose principal occupation consists of employment in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in connection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces.”]

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“(k) Until January 1, 1944, every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor on a farm, or whose principal occupation consists of employment on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and until January 1, 1944, no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in con-

nection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Following that, Mr. President, I should like to have appear in the RECORD a copy of the proposed substitute which I received yesterday morning from the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in a letter addressed to me, which is different both from the original bill which he introduced and from the bill which was reported by the majority of the Military Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

“That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“(k) Every registrant who is found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in Local Board Release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage or be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided further*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort.”

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Following that I should like to have appear in the RECORD the substitute as it is now offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the substitute proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to the

bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, viz: In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee, to insert the following: That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in Local Board Release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred by his selective-service local board from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage or be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided further*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective-service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have in the RECORD the substitute which was offered by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, and from which there has been no deviation since it was originally proposed.

There being no objection, the substitute proposed by the minority of the committee was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. O'MAHONEY to the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended be amended by adding the following proviso: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this subsection, a registrant shall be found by his selective service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in Local Board Release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in such release No. 164: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort, together with the mini-

mum standard of production per person which he determines to be applicable to such additional agricultural commodities."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it will be observed from what I have said that all this controversy revolves around the modification of the so-called Tydings amendment. It is important, therefore, to know what the Tydings amendment is. It was adopted late last year—I think in October—and was intended to provide for the deferment of essential farm workers who were necessarily employed in the production of essential crops. It provided further that deferment should be granted only so long as a satisfactory replacement was not obtainable.

The important thing to remember is that the Tydings amendment was based upon the theory and principle of the Selective Service and Training Act. It required individual judgment on individual cases. The vice of the proposal which was first offered and sent to the committee, which was then modified and reported to the Senate, and which has since been changed twice, is that in every form in which it appears it remains a blanket deferment, and takes no account whatsoever of the individual status of the registrant who is to be deferred.

The Selective Service and Training Act makes clear the principle upon which compulsory military service in a republic should be based, namely, upon the circumstances and conditions which surround the individual worker. This is the language which appears in the act. It is part of section 5 (e) of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940:

No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

Mr. President, that provision in the Selective Service and Training Act was the result of experience in the last World War. It was the result of a realization that the only just basis upon which any individual could be deferred was upon the basis of the circumstances and conditions which surrounded him. The provision was written into the law because it was recognized that unless deferment were based upon individual circumstances and conditions, the door would be open to draft evasion and to those who would seek to avoid the obligation of military service.

The proposal which is before the Senate in any one of its four different texts from beginning to end remains an open door to the evasion of military service, and there is no possible way of answering that indictment. Those who sponsor the amendment answer it only by saying it is necessary to do this in order to keep workers upon the farms, but, as the Senator from Maryland so clearly and forcefully stated earlier today, when we defer, in addition to those who are engaged in producing essential crops, those whose individual activities are not sufficient to make it appear that they are making a substantial contribution to the

war effort, we create the opportunity for evasion of military service, and for one, Mr. President, I say that that is a condition which no farmer in this country has appeared before the Military Affairs Committee to ask; I say it is an utterly unjust and unfair burden to place upon the backs of the individuals in the agricultural regions who are to be deferred by a blanket law passed by Congress.

Yesterday I received a letter from a lady in my State which is so brief and so clear that I think it deserves a place in the RECORD. It was written on March 3, 1943, from Buffalo, Wyo., and reads:

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Austin-Wadsworth bill seems best to me. To defer farm workers is to make a very weak minority group after the war. The returning soldiers, sailors, or marines will have a strong bloc behind them, they will have pensions, bonus, etc. The farm worker will have nothing, not even the big wages of the war worker in defense plants. If a person chooses to be with a minority, that is all right and their affair, but no one has the right to make any one join a minority.

I am a Quaker, proud of my minority, but understanding minorities makes me know none should be created.

I suggest a land Army with basic Army training then returned with honors to the fields.

Sincerely,

EMILY LOTT,
(Mrs. Howard Bryant Locke).

The author of this letter, of course, was urging another measure, not the one now before the Senate, and when she wrote the letter she did not know that the authors of the bill as it was reported by the majority of the committee proposed to give something to the farmer who should be deferred. They made this provision by amendment in the Committee on Military Affairs, and have retained it in each of the variations which have since been proposed. It reads:

Provided further, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective-service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort.

Mr. President, shall we pin a certificate of war merit upon the breast of every person who is deferred under this proposal, even though we know that his individual contribution is not sufficient under the present law?

The one great objection to the amendment which was offered by the minority in the committee was that it provided for an individual minimum contribution. Those of us who drafted the amendment said that no man should be included in a blanket deferment, and that no man should be deferred at all, unless in his individual case it was clear that he was making a contribution which met the standard set down by those who are endeavoring, to the best of their ability, to handle the agricultural problem of this Nation. That was written in by the minority. It was the one provision to which the majority has taken exception from the beginning, because, they say, "We do not want deferment to be governed by a minimum contribution," and the minute they say that, Mr. President,

they draw a criticism across the breast of every farmer who is deferred because the measurement has been avoided.

Now let us understand what the Tydings amendment was. It was very simple. No one had any difficulty in understanding it, I am sure. It provided:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

Mr. President, it is clear that to qualify for deferment under the Tydings amendment it was necessary, first, for each registrant to be found by the local board "to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation," and his deferment was to exist "so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement" is found. So here we have three standards: That the individual is necessary, that the crop is essential, and there must be no possibility of replacement.

The proposal which comes from the Military Affairs Committee, which is covered by the amendment now offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and called in this debate the Bankhead amendment, drops all those provisions save one, the provision that the registrant must be engaged in producing an essential commodity. No account is taken of whether or not that registrant is necessary to the production of the commodity, nor of whether or not a replacement is available. So, Mr. President, it becomes quite clear that the door is open to evasion of military service.

It will next be observed that the language of this amendment vests in the local board the discretionary authority to determine whether or not a registrant should be deferred. There never was any other thought about it. The theory of the Selective Service Act was that the local boards were the ones who would know best who should be deferred and who should not be deferred. So it was provided that the local boards could exercise their authority.

In my State I have heard no complaint whatsoever, except in a few minor cases, against the action of its local boards. There have, of course, been appeals, but so far as agriculture is concerned the local boards and the State appeal board have endeavored to carry out the intentment of the Tydings amendment, an amendment which up to February 18 had already brought about the defer-

ment of 364,000 men who had been found essentially engaged in the production of essential crops, and without available replacements.

In the face of that record is it possible to say that the Tydings amendment was a failure? Adopted only last October, it has already operated successfully. But while, as I say, I have received no complaint from Wyoming with respect to the operation of the Tydings amendment, complaint has been made from other States. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has sponsored a pending amendment, told the Committee on Military Affairs that the local boards in Colorado were disregarding that law; that they were not deferring essential workers, necessary workers, workers without replacement. And so in the committee I said—and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who is present, will bear me out—that the way to cure that defect is to provide by law that the local boards shall defer a man if he meets the standards provided in the Tydings amendment, and such a provision is precisely what was prepared and drafted in the minority amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question which has arisen in my State is, Who shall initiate the proposal for deferment? In order to be deferred, let us say, under the substitute amendment proposed by the minority, on whom does the initiation of deferment devolve?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would devolve upon the registrant, but there is no difference between the proposals before us, because in the Johnson amendment we find, on page 2, the provision—

That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective-service local board, * * * shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines—

And so forth. So there is still left in the local boards, under the Johnson amendment, an amount of discretion with respect to the registrant. But in the amendment which the minority has offered I think the Senator will find, if he will bear with me, that his difficulty is cleared up.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have recently returned from my State. The complaint I found there concerning the Tydings amendment—and the complaint comes from farmers and their sons—was that the claim for deferment rests upon them, and they do not like it. I talked to several farmers, each of whom said, in effect, "I need my son just as badly as I

can need him on my farm, but in order to have him deferred I must initiate the deferment. I must ask for it. That is the one thing I object to, and that is the thing my son objects to."

I think the arguments in favor of the minority amendment are excellent, but, in my opinion, there will still be left on the shoulders of the farmer whatever onus there is—and I think there is plenty—in asking for deferment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to say to the Senator from Utah that all these amendments constitute an effort to direct the discretion of the local board with respect to certain classes of registrants. I believe that the amendment proposed by the minority imposes a clear obligation on the local board to make the deferment regardless of whether or not the farmer or the farmer's son makes the application.

Let me say that discussion with respect to this very serious problem has been going on for several weeks. I think it may be properly said that the Senator from Alabama made a very notable and desirable contribution to the solution of the problem by the investigation of manpower which he initiated and which was so ably carried on in the Appropriations Committee under his direction. I believe he made a very valuable contribution when he called attention to the character of the problem which confronts the country. Let me say in passing that the amendment which is proposed by the majority does not meet the problem.

As the result of the discussions which were launched by the Senator from Alabama, as the result of hearings which were held by the Military Affairs Committee, by the Appropriations Committee, and by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, hearings at which representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of the Selective Service System were present, the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service System have been at work upon some steps to take care of the very situation suggested by the question of the Senator from Utah.

As a matter of fact, during the hearings, when my proposal was first discussed, I brought to the committee a representative of the Department of Agriculture, who told us that that step was in process. It has now eventuated into fact. The Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service System jointly have issued instructions to the local boards by which the county war boards in each county will have the authority to ask for the deferment of any worker. That has been done upon the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture who, under an Executive order issued as recently as December 5, 1942, was made Food Administrator. As soon as he had the authority he began to act. Word has gone forth, through amendments to Local Board Release No. 164, to make certain that the burden of asking for deferment may be transferred from the individual to the county war board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Following the inquiry made by the Senator from Utah, it has occurred to me that if the registrant is released from responsibility in the first place of initiating an inquiry into his individual status, transferring to the local board the responsibility to initiate the inquiry as to whether an individual should be deferred might result in mass deferment for a class. It seems to me that we run the very great risk of deferring men who either do not want to be deferred, or who ought not to be deferred. I do not see how we can avoid putting the responsibility on the registrant first to bring the situation to the attention of the local board and let the board pass on it. We should not pass on to the local board the responsibility of initiating the inquiry, on the assumption that everyone ought to have his status inquired into. It seems to me that mass deferment is bound to include many who ought not to be deferred for any reason. If the burden is on them to show that they ought not to be deferred, they probably would not do so, and there would be greater confusion in the administration of the Selective Service Act than now exists.

For that reason I feel strongly inclined to vote for the Senator's substitute for the minority substitute, in behalf of which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is speaking. I find difficulty in voting for any mass deferment by class, because obviously all persons in a particular class are not situated alike. Each individual situation must be considered. If we get away from that principle, I fear that the confusion will be worse confounded than it is at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is correct in his conclusions. An amendment which would make possible deferment by class would result in the creation of a haven for those who could somehow or other gain initial entrance into that class and thereby secure deferment.

Are Senators unaware of the fact that in many industries men are now employed who sought employment in such industries primarily for the purpose of avoiding military service? If we enact legislation of this character we shall run the extreme danger of another rush to the farms to escape military service. It should not be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator permit a further observation and inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Another condition has been called to my attention, which I am sure exists in many industrial centers. Men who have registered in their local communities have gone to industrial centers and have become employed in some capacity in industrial plants. When they receive notice of a call from their local boards they write back, or have the company write, that they are employed in a war industry.

The local boards are inclined to exempt them, not knowing whether the particular employment in which they are engaged is essential or whether their service could be dispensed with. None of the pending bills deals with the situation, but it seems to me that in many cases the draft boards in the communities or cities where the registrants are residing and working should have some jurisdiction to pass upon whether the work which a registrant is doing is essential, instead of having the question passed upon by the local board where the registrant was registered a year or 18 months previously. The local board is inclined to take the word of the registrant himself that he is engaged in an essential industry elsewhere, perhaps a thousand miles away.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Kentucky has put his finger upon one of the defects in the proposed legislation, including even the minority amendment, because it is an effort to deal with a specific problem, which is only one aspect of the whole broad problem of manpower.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin] has introduced a considered bill, the purpose of which is to treat this problem as a whole, including every part of it—not agricultural labor alone, not aircraft labor alone, not manufacturing labor alone, not labor in the manufacture of guns or tanks alone, not labor in cutting logs or mining metals alone. The bill is intended to cover the whole broad scope of the problem which lies at the very basis of this discussion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to ask whether the move for the deferment of a particular person must originate with such person, or whether he might be deferred upon the initiative of the board itself. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to reply in the first instance that it must be by the initial act of the registrant. I thought the Senator subsequently changed the answer and said that the responsibility was on the board. Will the Senator from Wyoming clear up for me the question of where he thinks the original responsibility rests?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Maine misunderstood me. I will try to clear up that question immediately.

Mr. WHITE. May I add a further word?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that I was referring to the county War Labor Board, which is not the local Selective Service Board. Instructions which have been issued by the Selective Service System and the Department of Agriculture authorize the county boards which have been appointed by the Department of Agriculture in every county to make requests for the deferment of any worker in order to stimulate the production of agricultural commodities.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Wyoming advise me whether in his view

the amendment which he has offered would deny to the registrant the right to make request for deferment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not.

Mr. WHITE. He would retain that right. Also the board would have authority to make the deferment if it saw fit to do so, even without a request from the registrant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. WHITE. I believe that principle to be perfectly sound. I think there should be a right in the board to make the deferment without regard to the desires of the registrant, if the board believes the man ought to be deferred. I have had brought to my attention a great many instances of farm boys being unwilling to take the responsibility of bearing what they consider to be the odium attached to a request for deferment. So it seems to me that there should be in the board authority to grant deferment as well as the right in the registrant to request it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me to make a statement in reply to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish first to answer the question raised by the Senator from Maine. I believe that what I will say will tend to make the situation clear.

I have before me local board release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, from the national headquarters of the Selective Service System, on the subject of classification of registrants in agriculture.

I also have local board memorandum No. 164-A, supplementing local board release No. 164. The subject is, Classification of registrants in agriculture—supplemental information.

These releases and others like them are messages from the national headquarters of the Selective Service System to each local board in the United States, saying in effect, "The problem of agricultural production is serious and important. We want you to know how we are operating and how we feel the Selective Service System should operate."

That amendment offered by the minority says to the local board that every person who comes within the classification mentioned in these releases shall be deferred. Therefore, in my opinion it is a mandatory direction to the local boards to defer the classes of persons mentioned. In the additional memorandum there is a direction from the Secretary of Agriculture to the county war boards, which operate through the Department of Agriculture, to make sure that this is done.

Mr. WHITE. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming would not deny to the registrant the right to initiate a request for deferment if he saw fit to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It certainly would not.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Not being a member of the committee, I may not be quite as familiar as are other Senators with the

effects which it is thought the bill would have.

I understand that the purpose in introducing the bill is to meet a possible food shortage. That being the purpose, I should like to know if it is the thought of the Senator who is now occupying the floor that there will be a food shortage if the present force of farm laborers remains on the farms of the country. Will there be a shortage of food in the opinion of the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot speak for the committee on that point. Of course, that is largely a question for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I do know that on the whole the production of agricultural commodities in 1942 was much greater than ever before. The farmers of the country did a perfectly marvelous job in spite of many handicaps; and as I stand here now answering the question of the Senator from Delaware, I am reminded of the fact that in January 1942 the Senate by an overwhelming vote adopted an amendment to the Price Control Act which, if it had been enacted into law, would have tied agricultural labor to industrial labor and would have prevented the migration of workers from the farms to industry—which migration is the cause of the farm-labor shortage.

The purpose at that time was not to tie agricultural labor to industrial labor. As a matter of fact, every recourse was adopted to prevent the action of the Senate from being enacted into law.

Mr. TUNNELL. It is my understanding that even if no more farm laborers were taken off the farms by the Selective Service Boards, there still would be a shortage of food.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that it still depends on what is meant by "shortage"; and that question again raises one of the curious inconsistencies of the legislation as I see it. As of the present moment, the shortage of food is occasioned not so much by a decrease in production, as it is by an increase of use. Today we have more need for food than we ever have had before. For example, persons who have gone into war industries, and who previously were unemployed, and previously had very little upon which to support themselves, now are working harder at physical labor, are getting good wages, and are able to buy more food. That is one factor.

Another factor is that under lend-lease we are shipping food products to such an extent as to constitute a substantial drain upon the agricultural supplies of our country.

The third factor is that we are supplying great quantities of food to the Army and Navy. I think the hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs will justify the conclusion that at least in some instances shortages of some kinds of food—tinned and canned foods, I believe—have been occasioned by the fact that some of the Army and Navy purchasing authorities have purchased far beyond their present requirements. One canner stated, as I recall, that the Army Procurement Office was buying canned food as though there never were to be another tin or can of food prepared, instead of letting the sup-

plies come in regular contributions over the period of production.

So, finally answering the question of the Senator from Delaware, let me say that the question of a food shortage is largely relative. I think there has been a great reduction in the production of milk, for example—a very dangerous situation—and there is likely to be further reduction of food production; but I doubt very much whether the reduction will be so great as to justify the alarm which has been expressed upon the floor of the Senate by some Senators who have said that we are facing a famine.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have understood that the purpose of Senators who favor this particular amendment is to prevent the further depletion of the supply of farm labor. Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that the amendment if adopted would bring about an increase in the supply of farm labor?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think it would cause an increase in the amount of effective farm labor. I think it would cause an increase in the number of persons who are on the farms, by bringing to the farms many persons who seek deferment from military service.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the increase would be, not an increase in farmers, but an increase of people who would call themselves farm workers in order to secure deferment; is that the Senator's view?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my judgment.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator. Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I assure the Senator that I shall not interrupt again, but I should like to propound a question. As I have understood the Senator's position, in my opinion he is faced on the one hand with what he calls creating a haven for men who might want to evade the operation of the Selective Service Act, and on the other hand with a realization that if we place the responsibility of initiation of deferment on the shoulders of the registrant himself an unwarranted stigma is created.

If I correctly understand the Senator's explanation to the Senator from Maine, it seems to me that if the minority amendment will do what he says it will do, he certainly has answered my question, which is this: If the minority amendment is adopted, then in connection with the rules and regulations which have been put out by the Administrator of the Selective Service Act, the Department of Agriculture, and the Commissioner of War Manpower, the county boards not only are given the right to initiate the deferment on the part of the registrant but the boards have imposed upon them the duty of initiating deferment; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Upon the local boards.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. If that is what the amendment would do in connection with the supplemental regulations, then, to me, that answers the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. That is exactly my understanding

of the intent and purport of the minority amendment and the effect of the rules and regulations.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely seek some information which thus far has not been supplied by any of the debate which I have heard.

A great many men have been induced to leave the farms and to go into industry because of the better wages paid in industry. None of the formulas thus far suggested would require or even invite those men to return to the farms; so no compulsion exists in that direction, and obviously the men are not going to return to the farms.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. Not only is what he says true, but the fact is that at least 60 per cent of all the men who have left the farms have gone into industry, not into the Army. I have seen some figures which indicate that the percentage is 70 percent, rather than 60 percent. In other words, 7 out of every 10 men who have left the farms have gone, not into the Army, but into industry; and the remedy which is proposed here is that we take them away from the Army.

Mr. BONE. All my queries and statements to the Senator are made merely because I seek information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, my remark was not directed to the Senator.

Mr. BONE. Yes; I understand that.

I do not know, and it has not been revealed, what percentage of men who were on the farms when the war started are now on the farms. I do not suppose anyone is prepared to break down the figures. Out of every hundred men who were on farms when we entered the war, I should like to know, if some one can inform me, approximately how many workers who are active still remain on the farms.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should be very glad to supply the figures.

Mr. BONE. I should be pleased to have the Senator do so, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Alabama supply the figures as a release, but I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not want the Senator to yield the floor.

Mr. BONE. I am trying to find out how much of a drain there has been on the farms.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The record supplied by the Department of Agriculture to the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Manpower shows that on February 1 there were on the farms 8,369,000 men over 14 years of age.

Mr. BONE. Over 14 years of age?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Down to 14 years of age—8,369,000.

Mr. BONE. How many workers were on the farms before we entered the war?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Twelve millions, at times. Of regular workers, usually about 9,000,000.

Mr. BONE. What interests me first, let me say to the Senator from Wyoming, is the fact that when in the latter part of last year—I think it was in October or

November—the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] suggested the desirability of adopting an amendment which went to the very heart of this problem; we adopted the amendment proposed by him, I believe. It provides that—

Every registrant found by a selective-service local board * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred. * * *

That is too plain for cavil or dispute; and, frankly, I am at a loss to know why we have to keep implementing the law all the time when we have a plain mandate and directive from the Congress of the United States to defer those men.

My present remarks are not made by way of criticism of anyone, because I realize that the situation is in a very fluid state and has many facets, and I am not out of sympathy with the Senator's suggestions in the views of the minority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. BONE. All we would be doing in following the minority suggestion would be to further clarify the situation, but we would not change the manifest purpose of the Tydings amendment, which was to bring about the deferment of those men. I cannot understand why public officials have not sense enough to know what Congress meant, and to implement the will of Congress by proper regulations.

We have said in a law, which is as formal a declaration as we can emit, that essential farm workers should be deferred; and I never have had it explained to me why we have to keep passing one law after another in order to try to implement our own will as expressed in the statute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation—and I made it before the Senator came on the floor—is that under the Tydings amendment, as the Senator has just read it, the discretion lay in the local or county boards, and each board would decide for itself what was an essential farm commodity and what registrant was necessary to the production of such farm commodity. So we had the result, according to the testimony given to the committee, that in one State one standard was being followed, while in another a very different standard was being followed. There was no uniformity of standards. It was even stated that in some States there was a divergence of standards among the counties in the same State. We seek now to overcome that by declaring to each county board what the standard is, so that under the minority amendment, there will no longer be any justification for a variety of decisions. In other words it is proposed to make it uniform by saying that if the commodity is listed in release No. 164 and if the registrant is making the minimum contribution set forth there, he shall be deferred, and there need be no more doubt about it.

Mr. BONE. Does release No. 164 define the various types of activities bringing men within the deferable class?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It defines exactly first, what the essential commodities are,

and, secondly, what the individual contribution should be.

Mr. BONE. Then why do not the local boards follow that directive and definition? Since the national organization has become definitive and has created the boundaries, why is not the matter reached by regulation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is being done. I think the regulations were issued on January 16. Now it is the 10th of March, and already up to February 18 364,000 workers have been deferred under the Tydings amendment. So, actually the record would indicate that the Tydings amendment and the local boards were performing the function originally contemplated.

Mr. BONE. I can see the purpose of the Senator's proposal in the language that is in italics, which does more clearly define those who shall be brought within the deferred class.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Human nature is universally the same, and the members of the local board are not an exception. We can imagine a board, consisting of doctors and lawyers and businessmen in a community, seeing the boys from the town going into the Army, and noting that some boys on the farm are not going into the Army, and then coming to the conclusion, "Well, farm work is no more necessary than the work of the shop, and we are not going to grant farm deferments." In any event there was that divergence of judgment, and now, by regulation upon the one hand and by this amendment, we are trying to direct that judgment.

I may say to the Senator that the minority amendment was presented to the Senate last week, and it was on Sunday or Monday of this week that the additional statements were issued by the Selective Service national headquarters.

Mr. BONE. I wish to say to the Senator—and I hope I am not taking too much of his time—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator cannot take too much of my time. I am always glad to try to answer his questions. He can ask more questions than almost any other Member of the Senate, but that is because of his very alert mind.

Mr. BONE. It is probably because I am more ignorant than some other Members of the Senate about things concerning which I should know more than I do, but I try to find out as much as I can, so that my vote may be as enlightened as possible.

I see the shortening line in the American diet, and I cannot conceive of any more ominous picture being presented to the American people than one of fear generated by a growing lack of food. I care not from what cause it may arise, it would probably precipitate greater panic in this country than almost any other manifestation of this war. Whether or not one has sympathy with the men working on the farm is beside the point, for wars are fought on men's bellies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator, and I have said that over and over again, but I think if the problem is created because we are making a

greater demand upon our facilities of production than such facilities are capable of meeting, then the answer is not to create class deferment; the answer is to cut down production.

Mr. BONE. We are deferring a great many men working in factories, and that, of necessity, because they are producing airplanes, guns, and tanks without which we could not fight this war. But I do not know to what extent younger men are being deferred for factory work; I take it that is in the sound discretion of the local boards, and they are exercising such discretion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know from the records of the War Production Board that there has been a tremendous achievement by American industry. We are now producing more tanks and guns and more airplanes and more ammunition than were produced throughout the whole of the First World War. As a matter of fact, we are now producing more airplanes than the Axis nations combined are producing. In December 1942 the output of airplanes reached the figure 5,449, if I remember correctly, and in February it exceeded 5,500. In other words, at this very moment we are producing airplanes at a rate in excess of 60,000 a year.

When we view the whole scope of the industrial output, when we realize that many of the munition-producing facilities do not need to be expanded, then we reach the conclusion that there is likely to be soon—not tomorrow, but soon—a decrease in the demand for labor for industry. We shall not need to expand certain plants. Already the building of certain new facilities has been abandoned. There remains to be accomplished an adequate production of high-octane gasoline, and of rubber, and an increased output of airplanes, for those who are directing our war effort realize that the airplane is going to perform the greatest function in this war; indeed, that it will bring victory. The record of MacArthur a week or 10 days ago in the Bismarck Sea is a demonstration of what can be accomplished by air, and already we are producing airplanes, as I say, at a rate of over 60,000 a year.

The time may come when we shall have to shift employment. Certainly we have stopped building military camps, and the labor that was heretofore involved in constructing such camps is no longer working at that task, but is engaged in other enterprises. The whole problem of necessary manpower, necessary labor, is being studied by the Military Affairs Committee in connection with the Austin-Wadsworth bill; and one of the vices of the suggestion here is that it proposes to deal with this all-over problem piecemeal, in a manner which will create more and greater difficulties than if we do not provide blanket deferment.

Mr. BONE. The thing which I believe should concern all of us is the fact that we are going to have to produce more and more food if our program is to be implemented as has been suggested by those in official life. I am wondering

how we are going to get greater production on farms, because that is one avenue of production the necessity for which will not diminish with the lapse of time, for we will have to have more and more food.

I agree with the Senator that we can reach the point of sufficient production of arms, ammunition, and matériel to meet war needs. The odd thing is that that is being achieved, and the stuff is being turned out to the accompaniment of a great deal of very bitter abuse of labor, although the record is a magnificent one, even considering absenteeism, which, in no small degree, is due to sickness, the lack of transportation, and other factors which are being casually overlooked by critics who are not very charitable. I am wondering what the Senator's view is as to what effect the adoption of the proposal might have on farm production? Is it thought it may stimulate the return of men to the farm, and, if so, how? Will a man who is engaged in the building of airplanes undertake to perform farm labor even for a few months?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The minority amendment will not stimulate the return of workers from industry to the farm.

Mr. BONE. I know of no way to do that except by making farm labor more attractive, by higher prices; and we may have to come to such a formula. I am sorry to have troubled the Senator so much.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to try to answer the Senator's questions.

Now, Mr. President, I desire briefly to analyze the minority amendment. It will be recalled that I discussed and tried to analyze the so-called Tydings amendment. The minority proposal retains the Tydings language and merely adds another proviso intended to direct the discretion of the local boards, but it bases the standard of direction upon the two fundamental factors, (a) the essential character of the commodity, and (b) the individual contribution of each registrant. This is the way it reads:

Provided further, That for the purposes of this subsection, the registrant shall be found by his selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in Local Board Release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943.

That clause clearly sets forth what the essential agricultural commodities are.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I will yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely wish to suggest that is writing into law a series of legislative directives for local boards.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. I continue the reading:

And (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in said release No. 164.

So here we retain the three factors of the original Tydings amendment, namely, essential commodity, necessary labor, irreplaceability; and we control the discretion of the local board with respect to the essential commodity and the individual contribution.

It was the provision with respect to the individual contribution to which the majority of the committee objected. I was asked to remove that, but I could not remove it, the minority would not remove it, because to do so would be to bring about the situation which I criticized in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, in that it would offer the opportunity for evasion by saying that in the mind of Congress it makes no matter whether or not the individual contribution is large or small.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have heard several references made to blanket deferment in regard to one or the other of the proposed amendments. I fail to see any general blanket deferment in either of them, because anyone to be deferred must be producing, either substantially full time or a certain number of units, the crops deemed absolutely essential by the Federal authorities. But in reading the two amendments, it appears to me that one of the main differences is that it would be more difficult, under the Bankhead amendment, for men working on farms to leave and enter industry, for they must get the consent of their draft boards before leaving farms to go into industry, whereas the O'Mahoney amendment does not contain any such restriction. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether it is not his understanding that the Bankhead amendment would make it really more difficult for men to leave the farm and go into industry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; but as the Senator from Maryland so clearly said this morning, the Bankhead amendment freezes these workers absolutely to the farm, and takes no account of wages at all.

Mr. AIKEN. It is industry which has taken the workers from the farm, but, as a matter of fact, the tide seems to have been stopped, and has turned somewhat, and the principal sources of new farm labor today are among men who are leaving industry. Perhaps they have earned enough money to get out of debt and are going back to the farm, perhaps they are going back in accordance with the request which was made about a month ago, either by Mr. Byrnes or the President, I forget which. The principal source today of new farm labor is those who are going back from industry. It still appears to me that the difference between the two amendments is that the Bankhead amendment would make it difficult for industry to solicit farm labor any longer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the essential difference between the two amendments is that clause No. 2 of the minority amendment was stricken out. It was stricken out because the sponsors of the

other substitute do not want to have any minimum standard of contribution, and to me that is its fundamental vice.

The provision of the Bankhead amendment to which the Senator refers was taken substantially from the Tydings amendment and since the minority proposal retains the whole Tydings amendment, it retains the provision the Senator has in mind. There is no difference between the Bankhead or Johnson amendment and the minority substitute in this respect.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment further, if a man is engaged substantially or full time in producing crops classified by the Department of Agriculture or the Selective Service as being absolutely essential, is he not going to produce eight units anyway?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That does not follow at all.

Mr. AIKEN. It is to be presumed he would.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator knows farmers and I know farmers of whom that could not be said, just as in industry there are workers who produce and workers who malingers. It does not follow at all.

Why should there be an objection to the minimum standard? The objection to the minimum standard is solely on the ground that those who object do not want any minimum standard; they want to defer everyone who is included.

Now I should like to conclude by saying that in order to cover this situation the minority added another proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort, together with the minimum standard of production per person which he determines to be applicable to such additional agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, that makes it possible for the Secretary to list additional commodities, and it also makes it possible for each local service board to go below the minimum standards, if necessary, in any individual case. That this is the interpretation by the Selective Service System is indicated by a letter which I have received from General Hershey, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1943.
The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am writing in answer to your inquiry concerning the interpretation of your proposed substitute to S. 729, the so-called Bankhead bill.

It is my opinion that in addition to deferring registrants meeting the eight and a fraction units-of-production requirement and the other requirements of the provisions of your proposed substitute, local boards may also defer persons who produce eight or less units if the boards find that the individual registrant is necessary to and regularly en-

gaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

I trust that this will satisfactorily comply with your request and serve your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,

Director.

SIZE OF THE ARMY—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the *RECORD* immediately following the remarks of the able Senator from Wyoming an address entitled "The Size of the Army," delivered in Washington last night by the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Tonight I wish to speak to you about the subtle danger which, unless guarded against, may destroy our present bright hopes for a decisive victory. It arises out of a mental attitude which is quite prevalent among our people, including many of the best of them, and has danger of which most of them are quite conscious.

We are raising and training a magnificent army. We are constructing and manning a superb navy. The fine young men of both these forces are now just beginning to meet the enemy and have already shown their mettle. They are equal to their tasks. Man for man they have proved themselves superior in skill, initiative, and resourcefulness to the men of the Axis Nations which we are fighting. There is no trouble with that section of the American people who are in uniform either on the land, on the sea, or in the air.

Nor does the trouble exist among millions of patriotic citizens at home, who have given up their dearest to the dangers of this war and who are cheerfully devoting themselves to patriotic tasks and sacrifices here and are thus trying in every way to hasten and push forward the war effort.

It is hard to analyze the attitude to which I refer. It doubtless arises from various causes and it manifests itself in many ways. Some call it the spirit of "business as usual," but that definition is not broad enough. Very often it appears in patriotic people who do not realize what we are up against and who honestly do not understand the purpose and necessity of some of the war measures which their Government is taking. But the attitude is just as dangerous even when it is innocent. I think it can accurately be called the attitude of trying to win the war—the most fierce and dangerous war which has ever confronted the United States—in some easy manner and without too much trouble and sacrifice.

Abraham Lincoln met it in the Civil War even after that war had been going on for over a year and many bloody battles had been fought. He said to a caller at the White House in September 1862: "The fact is the people have not made up their minds that we are at war with the South. They have not buckled down to the determination to fight this war through, or they have got the idea into their heads that we are going to get out of this fix somehow by strategy. They have no idea that this war is to be carried on and put through by hard, tough fighting; that it will hurt somebody, and no headway is going to be made while this delusion lasts."

Today this attitude which Lincoln described manifests itself when we say:

The Russians have destroyed so many Germans that Germany will not be able to carry on any more offensives.

Or when we say:

The German people are cracking.

Or when we say:

The best way to win the war is to give our allies plenty of weapons to fight for us.

Or when we say:

If we make too big a military effort we shall so dislocate our economy that we shall never recover; we shall create a permanent dictatorship and lose our historic freedom.

Or when we say other things which at bottom represent merely wishful thinking or the dread of personal sacrifices and the desire to find a better way out.

I believe that this attitude toward hard fighting on our part really underlies much of the criticism which is being directed today against the proposed size of our Army. On the other hand, I also realize that the Army plans involve many factors of great complexity, and that the doubt in many minds is perfectly honest and patriotic. Such minds are entitled to all the light which we can give them. It is my purpose tonight to try to explain to you how the size of the Army was fixed, the kind of Army we are training, and the purposes for which it is designed, and why it is impossible to reduce its size or interrupt its training without the gravest danger to our ultimate victory.

I. THE NUMERICAL SIZE OF THE ARMY

We are planning to have raised by the end of this year, 1943, an Army of 8,200,000 men composed of 7,500,000 enlisted men and 700,000 officers. This number will include an air force of about 2,500,000. It also will include the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps of upward of 150,000.

These figures were not arrived at by guesswork; they were the product of months of study by the General Staff and the War College. They were also the product of joint planning with the Navy over the future work of both these services. The proposed size of the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps were all determined at the same time, and all of these forces were balanced within themselves and against each other, and also in connection with the available manpower, the estimated capacity of production of equipment, and the estimated availability of shipping for their transport. These figures have received the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Navy and finally of the President. They have thus had the benefit of all the brains, accumulated research, and judgment which our governmental machinery provides for that purpose. They have not been worked out in disregard of but in full reference to our program of shipbuilding and production of equipment.

When we look at the estimated size of the forces of our enemies which are in the field against us, our numbers certainly do not look relatively too large. I realize that the figures of the hostile forces are estimates only but they are based upon the best information available to those whose business it is to make such estimates. In Europe the estimated forces of the Germans and their allies show about 14,000,000 men under arms. Russia and Britain together have a much smaller number. In Asia the Japanese have more than 3,000,000 men. These figures represent the aggregate of individuals in the various forces.

When we compare the combat units of the various forces the disparity between us is even greater. Our plans are to produce about 100 American divisions of ground forces, together with their auxiliary troops. Germany is estimated to have approximately 300 divisions, Italy 80 divisions, Germany's European satellites another 80 divisions, and Japan about 86 more. This makes an aggregate of about 546. Making all allowances for error these figures certainly make our ground forces seem of very modest size in comparison.

II. THE CHARACTER AND OBJECTIVE OF THE ARMY

It is not the purpose of our military leaders to create a huge defensive army, awaiting in

the United States such unknown and uncertain opportunities for its use as may hereafter occur. Their plans are much more wise than that. The Army is being raised on the fundamental and correct theory that we shall at once take the offensive and seize a number of priceless opportunities which are already opening up for us to end the war as quickly as possible.

III. THE NATURE OF THE TRAINING NECESSARY TO MEET THESE OBJECTIVES OF THE ARMY

To successfully meet these priceless opportunities we have put into effect the most carefully planned and coordinated program of military training which has ever existed in the United States.

The training contemplated by this program for the individuals is a process covering a long time. The Germans think 2 years necessary for such training of their men. We believe that our men can do it in 1 year but that is a minimum. Furthermore, the recruits are not all taken into the Army at the same time and all graduated at the same time. Such a method would be impossible for any country, even one as rich and powerful as the United States. And, furthermore, it would not meet the changing requirements of war. It would be too rigid and inflexible. Each of the reception centers and training schools takes in a succession of new classes and these groups are passed along the steps of the course until the final product in the shape of Army divisions is produced at the end. During each group's training the men are first instructed in the schooling of the individual soldier, are then crystallized into small and later large units for training in cooperative team action in modern warfare, and finally large divisional combat forces emerge from the other end of the system, each highly trained for its specific task. Every month the requisite number of men to form a certain number of divisions is taken into the reception centers at the entrance to the machine and every month at the other end that number of divisions is emerging highly trained for the various objectives to which they are to be assigned.

Anyone who studies this system as it is now running will be astounded at the careful planning which has been required as well as at the smooth continuity of the process of training which it has produced. It is now proceeding under the highest pressure of perfected action. Nothing like it has ever existed in this country before. It represents a great stream of training toward a carefully thought out goal. It has taken over 2 years to develop and construct this system; to train the instructors of its schools and to develop the immense overhead necessary for its smooth operation; and to construct the cantonments and other buildings for its use. Almost every unit in it has been devised and fitted into its place in accordance with the program of the size of the Army to be completed by December 1943, which I described a few minutes ago.

The first point to be borne in mind about this system of training is that the whole structure is complex and interrelated. Men are taught in a large number of different kinds of schools for different purposes of warfare. For example, in the ground forces there are special schools for infantry, artillery, tank warfare, antiaircraft gunnery, antitank gunnery, Signal Corps work with all its ramifications of scientific specialties, mechanics' schools, Quartermasters' schools and many more. In the Air Corps exists a similar large group of different schools for different purposes and specialties. The number of the graduates of these several schools must conform to the number required in the final product of combat forces and all must be taught to work with each other in carrying out the war task of the final division or combat force to which each belongs.

The second point to be remembered is that the whole process takes at least a year. If you interrupt the steady flow of entrants to

the schools in March 1943, the effect of this break will be produced a year later and then, if it proves a mistake, cannot be corrected for at least another year.

IV. THE DISASTROUS RESULTS OF INTERRUPTING THIS PROCESS

In the light of the foregoing description of the purpose and process of our Army's training, I think one can see more easily the danger of meddling with that process. Plan and process are tied together. The plan contemplates a succession of carefully directed blows at our enemies. The size and character of these blows and the aggregate forces which are necessary have been carefully thought out. Just as our present offensives are being carried out by men who have been through a year's training, the men now being brought into the Army are to be trained for campaigns a year ahead. Our main object is to continuously build up a force which will strike without interruption and with cumulative effect. That purpose can be thwarted by a mistake made now.

The various critics who today are asking that we should slow up or interrupt our work fail to realize the far-reaching effect of interruption. Furthermore they do not understand the psychology of combat. They do not realize that battles are won by continuous rapid blows upon an enemy and that when an enemy begins to show signs of demoralization these blows must be continued and, if possible, redoubled in order that he may not have time to reform his forces. Once the enemy is checked or shaken on the field of battle, he must be constantly pursued and hammered until he is completely beaten or surrenders. The very fact that it is known that we have trained forces ready to do this tends toward his demoralization.

On the other hand, the commander who, after an initial success, stops and gives his broken opponent time to reform and reorganize only finds that he must fight his battle over again. If, after the battle of Gettysburg, the Federal commander had been able to pursue and destroy his defeated enemy, the length of the Civil War might have been shortened by more than a year. On the other hand, the fact that in 1918 Foch was ready to remorselessly follow up and shatter the German enemy who had been shaken at Soissons on July 18 and again at St. Quentin on August 8, permitted the last great war to be finished in November 1918 instead of lasting over into 1919 as had been expected.

I speak with careful consideration when I say that if we should halt this great training establishment which we have now built and timed according to the present timetable of the war, we should deal a heavier blow to our hopes of a complete final victory than by any loss which we are likely to sustain on the field of battle.

V

Another argument of our critics is that by constructing too large an army we are making undue inroads into our limited manpower; that we are taking necessary workers from the factories which are providing Army equipment and machines; and that we are similarly slowing down the construction of merchant shipping, which is necessary to carry the Army and its supplies across the ocean. As I have already said, this argument ignores the careful study which has been given to this subject by our President and his military advisers. As between them and their critics I think it is the safer bet to trust the former. But there is this further answer to this argument which I think is conclusive. The argument depends upon the assumption that there is no elasticity in the efficiency of the civilian industries which are producing weapons and ships; that every man-hour taken away from industry and put into the Army must result in exactly the same ultimate loss in rapidity of production.

Every thoughtful citizen who will give any real consideration to the problem will know that such an assumption is not true. Only those who believe that our industry and our farming and our general civilian activity are really keyed to an all-out war are entitled to make this argument. It is the duty of every citizen to examine into his own life and his own community and see whether production in industry and on the farm cannot be increased enormously in efficiency; whether absenteeism, threatened strikes, general complacency, insistence of "business as usual," or even insistence on hoped-for standards of living, are not going a long way to prevent what could be accomplished by an all-out war effort. If you are content with the present situation and with the present results in industry, in agriculture, and in our civilian life, then I suggest that you go to one of our great camps and see our boys in uniform working. I suggest that you read the detailed dispatches from Tunisia and the southwest Pacific about the fighting efforts of our soldiers. I suggest that you compare your comforts of life with theirs, and then ask yourself again—are you content? I hope and pray that it will not require tragic disaster to bring our people to a realization of the facts. The great wave of patriotic ardor which was shown so dramatically in the weeks after Pearl Harbor must not fall away into arguments of rights, wages, profits, and relative advantage of one man over another.

The armed forces, the men who are going into actual combat, have placed their house in order. Their spirit and their program are all that patriotism and careful planning can effect. I now ask whether industry and agriculture should not likewise be put on a more efficient wartime basis. When you are driving a team of horses and one of them goes lame, you do not lame the other horse to equalize the team. You try to get two sound horses.

I fully understand that we must have essential food and necessary goods for civilian consumption. I am well aware of the difficulties in getting machinery and employees which our farmers and manufacturers are now experiencing, but I am convinced that with the initiative, resourcefulness, and willingness to sacrifice of the American people, these problems can be solved without crippling their armed forces.

For myself I have reached the conclusion that one of the reasons why industry and agriculture and the whole civilian population have not moved more rapidly toward an all-out effort is that we have relied almost entirely on voluntary cooperation. This voluntary cooperation would work with a large part of our population as soon as they clearly understood the need for it. But the effect of the recalcitrant or thoughtless few is so great upon the minds and efforts of others that I am convinced that the only way to accomplish the result which we must all reach, is through a general service act. This has proved true in England, and I believe it is now true here.

The issue between the proponents of the Army program and its critics in my opinion largely narrows down to this difference: The leaders of the Army are trying, by shortening the war, to save the lives of thousands of young Americans—lives vital to the future of this country. The opponents of the Army program are trying to avoid present trouble, the inconveniences and relatively minor sacrifices which would be involved in a more thorough and drastic reorganization of our industrial and civilian life for the remaining period of this war. I firmly believe that when the true situation is understood by the American people, there will be no doubt as to their decision. Even if, as Lincoln said in 1862, they have not yet truly realized what it means to be at war, they will soon do so. And when they have done so, they will be ready to make any sacrifice for victory.

REPORTS OF THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD (H. DOC. NO. 128)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA-FOLLETTE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

To assist the Congress in the development and consideration of appropriate legislation to achieve normal employment, to give assurance for all our people against common economic hazards, and to provide for the development of our national resources, I am transmitting herewith two reports of the National Resources Planning Board.

The first, "National Resources Development—Report for 1943," presents the results to date of the Board's work on post-war plans and a record of wartime planning activities. The Board proposes measures to meet the problems of the transition period from war to peace and for the longer range development of an expanding economy. It is appropriate that each year the immediate programs contained in the Budget of the United States should be considered by the Congress in the light of much longer range plans and programs. To facilitate such use of this report, I recommend that the report be printed, in accordance with past custom.

We can all agree on our objectives and in our common determination that work, fair pay, and social security after the war is won must be firmly established for the people of the United States of America.

Men in the armed forces and all those engaged in the war effort rightly expect us to be considering their future welfare.

We fight today for security for our Nation and at the same time we can endeavor to give our citizens and their families security against attacks from without and against fear of economic distress in old age, in poverty, sickness, involuntary unemployment, and accidental injuries. We need to look forward to the accomplishment of these objectives—world peace, democratic society, and a dynamic economy.

The second report transmitted herewith, on Security, Work, and Relief Policies has been developed over the last 3 years by the National Resources Planning Board, at my request, with the cooperation of the Federal agencies concerned and with the help of citizens with special knowledge and competence in this field. It reviews the accomplishments and experience of the last 10 years, pointing out some of the weaknesses of our security system, and suggesting ways of improving and strengthening the whole program.

Because of their basic importance to our national welfare during the war and after the war, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will give these matters full consideration during this session. We must not return to the inequities, insecurity, and fears of the past, but ought to move forward toward the promise of the future. When the Congress has agreed on procedures for the considera-

tion of these problems, the executive agencies responsible for the administration of programs in these fields are prepared to provide the Congress with all assistance within their power in devising appropriate ways and means to accomplish these high purposes.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 10, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is informed that it has been customary to refer matters of this kind to the Committee on Education and Labor. Should the committee provided for in the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] be established, it is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that the message and accompanying papers should be rereferred to that committee, but under the circumstances the message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to make the suggestion that in view of the very likely early adoption of the resolution now on the calendar, but which is for the moment before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, it might be feasible not to make any reference of the message until the resolution shall have been adopted and the committee appointed. It would save the difficulty of a rereference. I am not, however, particular about the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair conferred with the Senator from Georgia and this procedure was satisfactory to him, and it would be rather unusual to leave the message on the desk. Therefore it will be referred as suggested by the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE AGREEMENTS

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has just messaged to the Senate the lend-lease bill, which it has passed. The Committee on Foreign Relations today unanimously reported an identical bill, Senate bill 813. If it is possible to dispose of the pending bill today, I hope that tomorrow the Senate may consider the bill providing for the extension for 1 year of the Lend-Lease Act.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Scruggs
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Murdoch	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in approaching this question one is reminded of the old Indian fable about the blind men and the elephant. One blind man put his hand on the elephant's leg and thought he was touching a tree. Another blind man grabbed the elephant by the tail and thought he had hold of a rope. Another blind man touched the elephant's trunk and thought it was a spear. None of them could see the problem in its entirety.

The questions raised in the pending bill, of course, make it a farm bill, make it a military bill, make it an industrial bill—in fact they lead one irresistibly into the whole question of manpower.

One of the interesting things brought out in this debate is the fact that every Senator on both sides of the question has shown clearly his realization of the importance of having an adequate supply of food for ourselves and for others, the importance of having industrial production that will produce the weapons which are necessary, and the absolutely vital importance of maintaining a sound home front.

History has repeatedly shown that armies which were well led and were well supplied have laid down their arms when they were not satisfied that everything was well at home. I am the last person to minimize the importance of the Senate discharging its duty toward the home front, because the home front is the mainspring upon which the success of our military efforts depends. But, Mr. President, I do not think the bill before us will achieve the objective which it seeks. It is well known, I think, that a majority of the men who have left the farms have gone into industry, and a

minority have gone into the armed service, and it is rather like finding a man with a headache and putting a splint on his leg to enact legislation of this kind in the belief that it will really solve the problem.

In addition, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has brought out, the bill, if it shall become law, will create a great many poisonous discriminations between various elements in our population, and will be unfair, not only to those who are not exempted under it from the military service, but especially to those who are.

Of course, I recognize that it is much more convenient and it is easier and it is more direct, when one faces a shortage on the farm, as indeed we do, to limit something that the Government can arbitrarily control, and that is the size of the armed forces. That is a direct approach, and when it is stated that there are 11,000,000 men in the Army, as is often said—the figure looks pretty large—it seems as though it could be shaved down without doing any harm.

When the figures are broken down and we see what goes into them, they do not seem excessive at all. The figure of 11,000,000, I need not say, includes all our armed forces—the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Marine Corps, and the merchant marine. The largest category in that total is 7,500,000 for enlisted men in the Army. The total number for the Army is 8,200,000, of which 700,000 are commissioned officers, leaving an enlisted personnel of 7,500,000.

I do not wish to burden the Senate with too much detail, but I should like to break down that figure of 7,500,000 into its component parts. Two million two hundred thousand is for the Air Force, which has the first priority on men, matériel, and ships.

One million is for the Services of Supply, which, in a war being fought at the end of lines of communication as long as ours, are bound to involve tremendous problems. Take, for example, the lines of communication between here and Africa, as well as between here and the southern Pacific. The mere mention of the delivery of supplies over such distances suggests tremendous difficulties.

To recapitulate: 2,200,000 men for the Air Forces and 1,000,000 for the Services of Supply makes a total of 3,200,000. To this must be added 1,000,000 for our defense commands, one on the Atlantic coast, under General Drum, and one on the Pacific coast under General DeWitt, which include antiaircraft artillery protection for the industrial centers, which are a vital factor in a war in which science has increased the range of weapons as much as in the present war, that is, 3,700,000 for the ground forces, artillery, tanks, and so forth. It is not quite as large as the objective for our ground forces in the First World War.

If we were to remove the ground forces from the picture and have only an air force, we should still have to have our defense commands and our Services of Supply. Therefore we should still have to have 4,200,000 men under arms.

Whether or not we are prepared to accept the figures in total when we break them down and examine them in detail I believe we will find some reason behind them, and they will not seem quite so excessive and quite so fantastic as they do when they are studied in the bulk.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's breakdown of the Army is very interesting and informative and, of course, is accurate. There has been a great deal of confusion in the public mind—and I believe also in the congressional mind—as a result of the constant reiteration of the figure of 11,000,000 men in the Army. The figure of 11,000,000 men includes not only those in the Army but those in the Navy, those in the Marine Corps, and those in the Coast Guard, as well as those in the women's auxiliary organizations of both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. It also includes the merchant marine.

Mr. BARKLEY. It also includes the merchant marine. So when we speak of 11,000,000 men in the Army we are speaking not only of the Army but all branches of the service.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is correct. Of the figure of 11,000,000, only 8,200,000 is attributable to the Army, and of that number, 7,500,000 represents enlisted strength.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As we have heard in meetings of our committee—usually in executive session—that number does not include the women in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. It does not include women in any of the various branches of the Service.

Mr. AIKEN. And it does not include the merchant marine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was going by the statement of the Secretary of the Navy when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going by the testimony of Army officials.

Mr. LODGE. The figure of 8,200,000 pertaining to the Army does include the WAAC's.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In addition to the 11,000,000 men referred to by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, 1,000,000 more would be needed for replacements, making a total of 12,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. That goal is not expected to be attained until the end of this year.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not a reality at the present time.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

One of the untrue concepts expressed in regard to the Army is that it is a mass Army. A picture is created of a mass of soldiers marching along the road with packs and rifles, in the style prevalent at the time of the Spanish-American War. That is definitely not the case,

Mr. President. We have a mechanized Army. The choice is not between a large mass Army on the one hand and a small mechanized Army on the other. That might be a good choice in time of peace; but when we are at war it is desirable to have as large a mechanized Army as possible. That is what the present program really contemplates.

The suggestion has been made that we should reduce this contemplated size and, as a Nation which is so preeminently industrial, and such a large agricultural Nation, we should do what we can do best, namely, produce food and weapons, allow the nations with the larger number of men the use of our food and material production, and let them do the fighting. I believe every Senator in this Chamber has heard that suggestion. I shall not comment on it from the standpoint of gallantry or honor, because everyone can judge that for himself, and my views on that subject are of no interest.

From the standpoint of policy, however, I very much doubt the wisdom of taking such a step. We have already seen in this war nations which started out on one side and are now on the other side. We know that history shows that there is nothing permanent or sacred about the alliances which certain kinds of war create. In his farewell address George Washington said:

That it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

We are very fortunate to have allies. When a nation is at war the more allies it has the better. However, we must always be able to look out for ourselves if the wheel of fortune should take a turn which makes it inevitable for us to do so.

At the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, I said there was substantial agreement in the Senate on the necessity for complete victory. Everyone wants to do everything possible to bring about complete victory. The differences which occur between us here are differences as to method, and not as to objective. I believe it can be said that there are two schools of thought. There are those who want the country to make its major effort as rapidly as possible and win a victory in the shortest possible time. There is another group which wants to win a victory with as slight derangement and dislocation of the ordinary amenities of life as possible. There is a group which believes that time is on our side and that we should make the smallest effort consistent with winning the war.

There can be a great deal of argument as to which of these two methods is the best way to proceed. I happen to belong to the first group. I happen to believe that time is a commodity of which a poor nation has just as much as a rich nation. I happen to believe that the sooner we get the war over the better, and that it is

worth making a major effort and a major dislocation, if necessary, to attain victory. I happen to believe that we can do it, and I base that belief on what some other countries have done.

In preparing for armed forces totaling 11,000,000, we are preparing for a percentage of about 7.9 of our population in the service.

The testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs indicates that the percentage of approximately 7.9, which is our objective, compares with a percentage of 8.2 for the United Kingdom, and 8.8 for Russia.

Going to the other side and looking at the figures regarding the armed forces of our enemies, we find a percentage of 12.4 for Germany. I should say that the other countries, such as Canada, India, China, and Italy, do not make such a percentage contribution as is contemplated in our figures. However, these figures show that the United Kingdom, Russia, and Germany are making a larger contribution on the basis of the percentage of population than we are.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not possible for those countries to make such large contributions to the army because they are fighting near home and are not confronted with such long lines of communication as confront our country? Is not that the reason that Canada has not so large a percentage as Germany, Russia, or the United Kingdom? I think we must consider that factor.

Mr. LODGE. The percentage does not apply merely to the Army. The figure which I have cited includes the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the merchant marine.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator from Massachusetts taken into account that this country, in addition to producing necessities for our own Army, Navy, and civilian requirements at home, must produce food and supplies for the armies and navies of many other nations under lend-lease, and that those nations are correspondingly relieved from producing the same amounts, which they would otherwise have to produce? So far as the size of the Army is concerned, I do not think I differ with the Senator from Massachusetts; but in making comparisons it seems to me that we must take into account the fact that we have a much heavier call placed on our productive facilities and manpower than do other nations.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a factor which must be taken into account.

Mr. President, I said at the beginning that no matter how we start to consider this subject, whether we start from the viewpoint of the farmer or from the viewpoint of the airplane manufacturer or from the viewpoint of the Army or the Navy, or from whatever viewpoint we start, we always come to the question of manpower. That big question and the decision which we make regarding it flow directly from the opinion which the

American people have about the importance and the essentiality of winning the war. The decision as to the manpower question depends on the state of mind on the home front. So it is particularly necessary to look at the home front very carefully.

If one talks to soldiers who are returning from the war zone or if one happens to have had the privilege of having been in a combat zone, and can supplement that experience with conversations with others who have been there, he finds an astonishing unanimity of opinion as to the emotions which are aroused in returning soldiers when they reach this country once more. One who has been in the Middle East, for instance, and who has seen not only the sufferings caused by war itself but who has seen the refugee French, the refugee Yugoslavs, the refugee Greeks, the refugee Jews, and all the other miserable people who have been hounded from pillar to post, who have had their near and dear ones killed, who have been utterly impoverished and ravaged—if one has seen the hatreds that exist over there, and then returns to this country—if, for instance, he returns by airplane, and looks down from the window of the plane and sees below him the coast of Florida, and, after he lands, sees once again American young men and American young women and gets the first glass of milk that he has dared drink in a long while—I mention those incidental things—above all he has the feeling of hope, the feeling of the worth of the individual man, the feeling of the promise which the future holds for this country; and he says to himself, "Yes, there is a civilization worth saving, and it is right here in the United States of America."

Those of us at home can profit by the emotions of the returning soldier.

Another thing which naturally occurs to one who has been on the other side of the ocean and who, for instance, has tried to move tanks from one place to another, who has been up all night and all day, has not had much to eat, has not had any sleep, and whose sole preoccupation has been to get the tanks moved from one place to another—I mention that as an illustration; I could have mentioned one of a hundred other things—is the idea that the winning of the war is the biggest thing that there is. Then he comes back to this country; and the prominent utterances and speeches which come to his attention are those in which concern is expressed about the third world war, in which concern is expressed about how are we to play a game of chess, although the pieces are not yet on the chessboard. Is it any wonder that constituents of mine write to me—and I am sure other Senators have had similar experiences—that they feel that from Washington there emanates the belief that everything is really going fine. If the winning of the war is taking care of itself, they say, what is the point of putting up with all these inconveniences and all these dislocations, and why should people meekly put up with administrative incompetence?

When I observe the number of prominent men who never lose an opportu-

nity, not to discuss the war, but on every occasion to discuss what will occur after the war, it seems to me we can hardly blame the people for having the feeling I have just described. And when we observe the way in which the voluntary system of organizing manpower is not being used, we cannot blame the people for having such feelings.

Mention has been made this afternoon of the Austin-Wadsworth bill which would seek by compulsory means to take a man from a place where he is not needed and move him to some place where he will be useful. I do not believe that today the appropriate agencies in Washington know where such people are to be found. For instance, I do not think the agencies in Washington know where men who are trained in certain types of metalwork are located—men who have nothing to do in the places where they are, and who are needed elsewhere.

I shall not shrink from voting for legislation to effect appropriate transfers if I am convinced that such legislation must be enacted in order to save the country; but to pass such legislation is a harsh and sharp thing to do at best, and certainly it would be a terrible thing to do if such a law were not well administered. Many of our laws have not been well administered. We have had a great deal of bungling; a great deal of needless harm has been done. To take a man from his home in Boston and send him to some place far away from his home, all because of administrative incompetence, would be a terrible thing to do. It would be bad enough to do it for a good reason.

Yet I believe that our people have unlimited good will toward the purposes we seek to achieve. Can anyone doubt that if the names and addresses of the people who have skills, and whose services now are surplus, were known, and if an appeal were made to their patriotism by the President, who is concerned with the home front, a great many of them would respond on a voluntary basis? However, the voluntary system has not been given a trial. The voluntary system has not been organized. We can organize a voluntary system just as well as we can organize a compulsory one; but I cannot see that a voluntary system has been organized.

Mr. President, there are two schools of thought relative to the winning of the war. One school of thought is that of those who want to make a major effort at once and get the war over with quickly. The other school of thought is that of those who want to make the least effort consistent with victory.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. In my mind I do not divide the issue in that way. I want to keep the strongest and largest possible combat force hitting the enemy, and hitting him every hour of every day of the combat, but I want to be sure that the men we put into combat can be maintained on their feet and in fighting trim by not being neglected because of any failure on our part to supply them

with the absolutely necessary foods, fibers, and minerals and to provide for the production and fabrication of those supplies and their transportation to the battle areas.

Mr. LODGE. I appreciate the force of the Senator's remark. Of course, those who have confidence in the accuracy of the figures of the General Staff believe that what the Senator wants done can be done. I heartily agree with the Senator that of course that must be done. I believe it can be done and can be done under the system which was very well described by Woodrow Wilson in language which is printed at the head of the introduction of the Industrial Mobilization Plan, a plan which I wish had been more closely followed when the present war began.

Woodrow Wilson used the following words:

The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.

I think there is still a great deal of truth in that statement. In making our decision about the pace at which we want to prosecute the war and about the intensity of sacrifice and dislocation that we want to impose upon ourselves, I think we should always remember the young men who are in Trinidad, Paramaribo, Belem, and Natal, and then, across the ocean, those who are stationed all through the Sahara and tropical Africa, and those who are serving in places all the way across the Pacific to Australia, and who are working under very unpleasant conditions—young men who probably will not have the excitement and adventure of combat. They will have to endure the long, slow, boring grind of service in out-of-the-way corners of the world, where the climate is disagreeable and unhealthy, and where, even with the best efforts on our part, they will have monotonous diets. The thought those young men have—and it is the thought that sustains them—is that at home everyone is working himself up to the highest pitch to give the enemy both barrels just as fast as possible. That is what they think. The young men who are in the actual combat positions in Africa, in the Solomon Islands, or wherever the fighting may be, are sustained by the thought that no effort is being spared here to get this thing over with as soon as possible. That is the phrase one hears.

So, Mr. President, in concluding, I hope that we will keep faith with those particular aspirations. I think we can do it; I think we can do it without harm to America; I think we can do it by spontaneous cooperation; but there has got to be a real effort made by the leadership of this country to create such conditions that that kind of spontaneous cooperation is possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words on the pending amendment and on the pending bill this afternoon. First, I wish to say that I think the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has done a valuable service by bringing to the attention of the country the serious trouble which faces it. I do not believe that either the amendment or the

bill will afford a solution for the great problem which confronts our people. The only solution will be in the eventual passage of a carefully drafted law somewhat along the lines of the one introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and by Representative WADSWORTH in the House of Representatives. But, Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be kept clear, insofar as my vote is concerned, I desire to speak on the pending amendment.

Let me say that I have spent many sleepless hours thinking about the situation with which we are confronted and thinking even more about the 105,000 boys from the small State of South Carolina, the majority of whom have volunteered and others of whom have been selected to carry on the battle. Some of them are fighting on foreign soil; some, sad to say, Mr. President, are now sleeping below the soil; and others are preparing themselves to go forward and carry our flag on to victory. It is of them I think and worry.

Mr. President, I was not a Member of the United States Senate when the selective-service laws were passed. After the passage of the original law, in which certain deferments were granted, there were also authorizations issued by the Director of Selective Service to grant other deferments. As the Governor of South Carolina, I protested to General Hershey many times against deferments, and I shall vote against any deferments and against any bill that may be introduced that sets up by law deferment for any group including married men. Of course, I believe that single men should be first selected. I believe that married men, without children, should be selected next, but I also believe, if it is necessary to select married men with children, it most certainly should be done. Married men with children certainly have as much at stake in the welfare of America as has anyone else.

As a Member of this body, I voted to select 18-year-old boys and take them from school, and from the farms and from the factories. I voted under no condition to give them exemption because they went to college and were sons of well-to-do people, and I sincerely hope that the law will be enforced in its letter and in its spirit. Selective Service is the fairest way to obtain the necessary armed fighting forces. It is my opinion that the selective law should also be used to obtain merchant crews when and if the voluntary system fails to produce a sufficient number of men. The brave and heroic merchant crews are, in reality, a part of the fighting forces of our Navy.

I am well aware that the farmer has not received the treatment accorded others, because when ceilings were placed on farm prices and wages, industrial wages had already far exceeded, in proportion, farm incomes. Naturally, large numbers of farm helpers, because of such financial conditions, left the farms.

There was also provided under Executive order deferment for certain war workers. This may have been necessary temporarily until others could be trained, and, of course, to some extent it may be

necessary today; but such matters should be handled by the local boards, as in the case of deferment for farmers under the Tydings amendment for which I voted. There should be, in my opinion, no interference with the Selective Service by laws creating for any group blanket deferments throughout the United States. Each individual case should be handled on its merits by the local boards.

If I am any judge of those who have always been so kind to me at the ballot box, the people of South Carolina, whom I in part have the honor to represent, wish no preferential deferments for anyone or any group.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is the most important vote I shall cast since my reelection by the people of my State last summer, I wish to express myself further on some matters. Since the meeting of the Seventy-eighth Congress reference has been made by other Senators to what the people expect of them, and, therefore, I want to take this opportunity to state what the people of South Carolina expect of me. I know in expressing this opinion I voice the wishes of the majority of the people of South Carolina. Their wishes and desires, Mr. President, are for me, as their United States Senator, to support 100 percent the war program of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. They do not expect any preferential deferments; they do not expect any preferential treatment; they wish all to be treated alike.

As to the size of the Army, it is their opinion and my opinion that that is a matter for the Commander in Chief, together with the generals and admirals, to determine. If I should be called upon to vote as to the size of the Army or any matter connected with military objectives, I shall vote to support to the end those in command of the fighting forces.

On the other hand, so far as the domestic home front is concerned, the people of South Carolina, as they have expressed themselves on every occasion, are desirous of streamlining the Government and cutting out all activities which can at this time be deferred, so that all our interests, resources, and work wherever and whenever possible may be used to speed our cause to victory. I propose, on every occasion, to vote their convictions on these matters.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I am here in the United States Senate because of the generosity of the people of South Carolina. I made a contract with them to support the President in the war effort, and I made a contract with them to support their convictions as best I could interpret them on matters not pertaining to the war. Here let me say, Mr. President, that some matters have been brought up in the Senate recently which have been opposed by those who voted for me and made possible my service as a Senator. I propose to do what I can to stop such measures. I have been, as have most of my colleagues, disturbed because of deferments which have been given to Government employees. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] called attention to these matters last fall. The people

want fair and just treatment of all citizens whether they are in the employ of the Government or in private employment, whether they are working on farms or in factories.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the "negligible" subject of farming. We, as the Representatives of the several States, must decide whether or not farming is essential to our war effort. If it be true that agricultural production is not only necessary to support the Army of this Nation in the matter of food, but also, as well mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, if we are to feed the men of other countries, agriculture is certainly an essential industry.

We must decide, not flippantly, but as serious men, whether we consider production of food essential to winning the war. That having been determined the question is, Who is to produce the food? From listening to the debate here one would think that any man could go out and produce the food necessary to feed the country. It is not such a technical matter, so far as small grain is concerned. One can sow it by machinery, reap it by machinery, and thresh it by machinery. But that is only a small part of food production.

Not only is the harvesting and preservation of the food essential but one has to be trained in its cultivation. We hear much talk about the relation of the selective service to food production. The question of production can be made very practical if we will define what is the duty of the selective service. I am not frightened by the statement that we are separating a certain class to be deferred. The fundamental question underlying the proposal is, Is this class essential? We are taking men into the Army through an arbitrary method, and are fixing their wages. The bill before us does not propose to do anything of that kind. It merely says, "Let us take the men who are qualified to produce the crops."

I should like to go into some of the particulars of what it takes to make farming an essential occupation, but before I leave the draft board question, let me say that the draft boards are as confused as we are. To give an illustration of the confusion, I may cite the case of a certain physician in my city who had quite a hospital, known as the Saunders Memorial Hospital. The Army authorities came to my town, and he thought perhaps they might need his hospital. He entered into negotiations with them, and understood that they would lease the hospital. They agreed upon a lease, or he felt they had done so. Then the question arose as to the purchase of the hospital. He came to Washington, and thought perhaps he had negotiated a sale of the property. It now turns out that they have not leased it and have not bought it. He had dismissed his organization, and was getting ready to move out, but now he is without a hospital and without a job.

The physician appealed to me, and I called in the general who was said to be the head of the organization with

which he had dealt. The general said, "This man listened to those who had no authority." Some of us have had experiences along that line. We do not know whether we are coming or going. The physician, thinking he was acting with a man who had the authority of the Government behind him, agreed to lease his property, and then to sell it. He had dismissed his organization, had broken up his nurses' training school, but he was left high and dry, and now it is said the only thing he can do is to go into the court of claims and sue for redress.

Mr. President, that illustrates the manner in which our war efforts are being organized. As to the Selective Service, the theory is fine. The Selective Service board in my county is more or less acquainted with the farmers of the county, and when a farmer tells the board that it has taken a man who is essential, the members of the board know the man with whom they are dealing, and have reason to be in a position to know whether he is stating facts.

Let me give a personal illustration. I had a hand on my place who was competent to run machinery. Those who have dealt with the Negro race and their ability to operate machinery know what usually happens when they are placed in charge of it; but this man understood machinery. He was drafted, and I wrote the board a letter telling them that the man was essential to the proper cultivation of my farm and the proper utilization of my tractors and trucks. I thought they had, under the Tydings amendment, made arrangements for him to stay on the farm, but the day before I left home, just after I came out of the hospital, he was notified of his induction, and was ordered to prepare for service in the Army. I came to Washington and took the matter up with General Hershey and certain of the manpower organization. The result was that the man was allowed to remain on my farm.

The draft board in this case were acting under their interpretation of the law, and they thought this man should be taken away. Had he been taken away, the production of my whole farm, and the use of my tractors, would have been reduced by one-half.

Reading the modified Bankhead amendment we find that it provides:

A registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor on a farm, or whose principal occupation consists of employment on the farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity, shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training.

We must decide whether we believe that production of food or agriculture is essential to winning the war. We hear learned talk about men who produce a pumpkin or a bushel of potatoes. What in the name of heaven has that to do with a man who is running a farm and knows all about it? I do not know where in the world the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] got his idea that before one can be qualified as a farmer he has to produce two bushels of potatoes, a quart of sirup, and certain other things,

and prove it. One would have to take the Army suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONCE] to enforce such a law as that. It is absolutely absurd. Josh Billings said a thing which I think applies perfectly to this body. He said, "My son, come to the Senate and see how great an amount of conjecture they can get out of so little fact." That is applicable to us all.

As to the matter of cultivation, how many of us here are familiar with the difficult details connected with cultivating food crops? How many Senators know how much fertilizer should be used in production, and the character of the fertilizer, to get maximum production of a given plant? During the last war I busied myself in going from Maine to Florida in order to get soda, which is one of the essentials in the production of all food crops. How much does a farmer need, when shall he put it on, has the rain nothing to do with it, has the season nothing to do with it? Before we get through with this matter I think we will all have to ask God to come down and make his laws accord with our wishes. We may talk about production until doomsday, but unless the seasons are good, a farmer cannot make a crop.

Not only is the application of fertilizer on the Atlantic seaboard essential, but a farmer must know what kind he needs, and he must know about the soil upon which it is to be applied. That cannot be learned in a day. Farming demands a certain bucolic skill, comparable to the skill which characterizes the mechanic. The seasons determine when the cultivation must be made, and a farmer has to have men who understand the situation.

There has been talk about getting school children and the urban population to help. God knows I do not want them to come to my farm. To cite an example of what happens when one unfamiliar with farming is employed: A brother of mine was very philanthropic, entertaining theories much like many we hear of now, and he got a man off a vessel whom he employed to go to the field and thin some corn. Some grass had grown up in the corn, and my brother tried to show the man the difference between the blade of the corn and the blade of the grass. At noon he went down to see how the worker had gotten along, and found that he had chopped up all the corn and left the grass. [Laughter.] The worker did not know the difference between grass and corn, and had not correctly understood my brother's instructions.

Another element involved is that of insects. I lost a whole corn crop last year because of a little insect known as the webworm. I had not placed on the fallow ground a sufficient amount of lime to destroy the worm, and planted my corn, and the worm destroyed the whole crop.

Some persons in authority may think it does not take experience to do farm work. They think men can be sent out and told to go ahead and plant, regardless of the preparation which is necessary, or the character of the soil, whether it is suited or not to certain crops.

Mr. President, I could consume several hours explaining not only the absolute need of experience in growing a given crop, but the need for knowing the character of the soil upon which the crop is grown. If we can raise an army of 11,000,000 men, and feed such an army, and feed the people of America, as well as a great part of the population of the world, all with depleted manpower, very well. But Secretary Wickard appeared before our committee and told us that not only are we going to have a scarcity of manpower, but that we now have a scarcity of farm implements. We have, as well, a scarcity of fertilizer. It is proposed that we shall set out to feed ourselves as well as the rest of the world, without sufficient farm implements, without fertilizer, and without enough manpower. We must face the problem as sensible men.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, it is my thought that there is a great difference between the conclusions reached by the statisticians, data gatherers, and the hordes of others in the departments, and those who are actually engaged in operations in the fields. I know from my own personal experience that I have until April 1 to find some more help to do the work on my farm in connection with the maintenance of my dairy herd. If I do not obtain this farm help I must offer my stock for sale. Then one more of the many dairy farms of my State goes out of production.

The problem of vanishing farm help is the vital production problem faced by many persons with whom I am acquainted—farmers who are actually engaged in production of those farm products which are required to feed our combat forces, meet our lend-lease obligations, and supply our industrial workers, and, last, to maintain our civilian populations. If we fail to feed all these people, how can we achieve our military objectives? How can we win the war?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon has learned that old adage that figures do not lie, but that liars can figure. That is what is the matter. The figures may not lie, but those who figure do lie.

Mr. President, the fundamental question which is worrying me is, Are we going to attempt to preserve the agricultural production of America, or are we going to turn farm workers loose and take our chances? Everyone knows that there is an element of skill in farming. It is said we must have an army of so many million men. On what is such an army going to be fed? If we are to have so large an army, we must provide a sufficient amount of food. The fundamental question is, What is essential to the winning of the war? The sine qua non is food. Without it an army cannot fight.

Another element which confuses the situation is rationing. I say without fear of contradiction that regimentation and rationing have done more to decrease production than any other one

thing. The farmers themselves do not know what to do.

Let me illustrate: Last year there was an abundant pear crop in my section, and also an abundant fig crop. The housewives wanted to preserve these crops, but found they could not get sugar. So, the figs and pears laid on the ground and rotted, simply because rationing had gone into effect, and the housewives could not get sufficient sugar to preserve those crops.

Mr. President, all this messing with natural law has brought us to the situation we are now in. I say that the American people are just as patriotic as those who are rationing them, and if we say to the American people, "We must have food," and give the people a chance, and not have priorities on machinery, and priorities on fertilizer, but see to it that the farmers get the wherewithal, and turn them loose to produce, they will produce.

A few years ago we had, under the so-called ever-normal granary, a surplus of wheat and a surplus of corn, and took a few million hogs and dumped them in the Mississippi River. We were overproducing then. Now all that has been changed, and we are underproducing. I hope this body will vote to provide that every farmer working on a farm and producing will be permitted to remain unless he himself elects to get up and go elsewhere.

Mr. President, the main reason for depletion of the farms and the bringing about of this terrible condition is the determination on the part of those controlling the administration that the farmer shall not get a just price for his products. Earlier today the Senator from Maryland read some figures showing the wages the farmer receives as compared with the wages received by the industrial employees. The whole question depends upon whether groups are organized to vote or are not. If I could organize the farmers as completely as the industrial workers are organized, and get them to say "We are not going to vote for this or that candidate," a different condition would prevail.

I do not know whether we are going to say that there shall be a deferment for the farmer. We digress; we sail, in our minds, over to Africa and to Australia, but forget the necessity for encouraging the man at home.

Mr. President, I hope the Bankhead amendment, which seems to me to be the only reasonable proposal before us, will be adopted. I do not think it requires that a farmer shall produce a certain amount of pumpkins, or a certain number of bushels of wheat, or sacks of potatoes, but it provides that if he is working on the farm and producing he shall stay there and not be disturbed. That is all there is to the Bankhead proposal.

Talk about class legislation! We will surely have class legislation in the fall of 1944 if some practical relief is not given to the farmer. Columnists and public writers were referring a short time ago to the "farm bloc" and the "greedy farmer." Why should he not be greedy? God knows he has been starving from the

days of Adam until now. He has never been given a chance.

This morning I received a report from the market to the effect that an order had gone out that a certain amount of cotton was to be released at a price below the market price. Cotton dropped another dollar a bale. That meant that the farmer who had cotton to sell had to take a dollar a bale less.

Congress has passed many laws. In passing laws let us make them so clear that a fool can understand them. Fools do not understand many of the laws we have passed. We pass laws, but the administrator of the laws reads into them anything he wants to. We have degenerated to such a point that we are nothing more than an appropriating committee. We appropriate and the other man spends.

I want to talk on the subject from the standpoint of an impoverished practical farmer. The element of cultivation has not been mentioned at all in this debate. The element of the experienced hands necessary to do the work has not entered into it. I saw a neighbor of mine ruin a whole cotton crop by plowing it too soon after a rain. Yet it is proposed that the city man go into the fields and cultivate and gather our crops.

The discussion has gone far afield. The fundamental question is, Shall we have an adequate food supply, and if so, how will we get it? The farmer should be permitted to farm wherever he can farm. If he is on a farm and producing he should be deferred.

Someone has said that country is best governed which is least governed. God knows if that is so, we are gone, we are helpless.

A ceiling has now been placed on pulpwood. If a ceiling could be placed on those who lack intelligence along certain lines I would vote for such a ceiling.

I want it understood that I believe the Congress of the United States should pass the laws which govern the people. They should not be governed by fiat and Executive order. One day I was making a speech and I was asked if I did not want to cooperate. I do. However, under the present situation the bureaucrats "operate" at the other end of the Avenue, and we "co." They have it nicely divided. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not know whether we can retain enough really practical farmers to support the world. To quote Mrs. Luce, we are now in the midst of "globaloney," and God only knows when we will get out of it. [Laughter.] However, the question before us is, Shall we assume the responsibility of providing enough labor to produce the required quantity of food? We cannot do so unless we pay attention to those who are qualified farmers. Except for those who come from the farms, there is not a Member of the Senate present who knows how to operate a farm, or work on one. Not only is seed necessary, but the preparation of the soil is also necessary. When the seed has been planted the cultivation of the growing crop is essential. I recall that someone once

said that the boll weevil could become a grandmother over night. What Senator present knows anything about protecting even a turnip crop? I once had turnips planted, and they suddenly started to die. I sent to Washington for aid in saving my crop and a man came down to my farm. He examined the turnips. I had been dusting them with calcium arsenate and other poisons. He said, "The web worm is attacking your crop and unless you secure a certain kind of poison for it your whole crop will be destroyed." I secured the poison and saved the crop. If I had come to the Senate for information as to what was destroying the crop I would have been told just to plant turnips. "Just sow them and let them grow."

Mr. BARKLEY. Was it a bureaucrat in Washington who saved the crop?

Mr. SMITH. No; it was not a bureaucrat. It was a man with some sense. He had escaped the odious faults of this damnable bureaucracy. He was in Washington before the bureaucrats gained control.

Mr. President, I hope we will take a sensible view of this problem and vote to preserve the men who are on the farm raising crops with such aid as they may be able to obtain and supervise.

Mr. President, I have not said all I wanted to say, but I must conclude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot obtain a vote on the pending amendment this afternoon. I have consulted with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the author of the pending substitute, as well as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and other Senators. As a result of those conferences I now ask unanimous consent that not later than 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon the Senate proceed to vote on the O'Mahoney substitute without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I had prepared and desired to offer a substitute for the pending bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's substitute would not be in order.

Mr. PEPPER. I am aware of that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The O'Mahoney amendment, or substitute, is the last degree in which an amendment can be offered. It cannot even be amended.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that; but availing myself of the right of discussion and debate before a vote is had, I desire to submit a proposal which is a closer approach to the problem under discussion than is either of the pending substitutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Florida can offer his amendment after the O'Mahoney substitute shall have been disposed of. It cannot be voted upon before the O'Mahoney substitute is voted upon, and it cannot be offered as an amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. I am aware of that; but I should like the Senate to have the benefit of the proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can offer it and have it printed as another amendment to the proposed bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to offer it as an amendment this afternoon so that it will be in the Record, and be subject to debate tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no objection to that. However, that has nothing to do with my request for an agreement as to voting.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, has any agreement been proposed relative to the allocation of time tomorrow which would deny me even 10 or 15 minutes for debate on the pending substitute?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; there has been no agreement as to allocation of time. I suggested 2 o'clock as the time to vote. I believe the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] are among those who desire further to discuss the pending amendment. Two hours would seem to provide ample time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish also to speak on the pending amendment if there will be sufficient time. Otherwise, I shall have to object to the request. I should like a little time to discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that the time will be ample without allocation.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Record show the figures which I have just received from the Selective Service officials. The so-called Tydings amendment was adopted on November 13, 1942. Between November 13 and November 30, 1942, 24,278 farm workers who otherwise would have been inducted into military service were deferred under the amendment. The number during that month was not great because the act was new, and it took some time to send regulations to the various draft boards throughout the country. Subsequently the regulations were greatly liberalized.

During the month of December 1942, 168,066 additional farm workers were deferred under the Tydings amendment.

In the month of January 1943, when the Selective Service officials were calling for about 400,000 men a month, 171,638 farm workers who would otherwise have been inducted, were deferred under the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does that mean that about half of all the registrants who were called up were deferred?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The practice is to continue calling until they get the 400,000. They may have to call 600,000 before they get the desired number.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They may not call more than 400,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the month of February 1943, when another 400,000 men were called up, 130,460 were deferred under the amendment, making a total for the period between November 13, 1942, and March 1, 1943, of 494,462

regularly employed and irreplaceable farm laborers, who were deferred under the law on the statute books at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was done by the local boards.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. These figures have been furnished by General Hershey's office. They have been checked and rechecked. They contain 1 month's additional figures to those referred to today by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself. The final figure for the 3½ months is 494,462 which represents the regularly employed and irreplaceable farm workers who have been deferred under the so-called Tydings amendment.

I wish the Record to show that while the so-called Tydings amendment may have its imperfections, and while it may be violated in certain communities, it is contributing no small part in retaining workers upon the farm even without the addition of the liberalizing amendment offered by the minority of the committee and sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland has not given vital information concerning how many of the number to which he has referred were deferred under the so-called Tydings amendment, and how many were deferred for other reasons.

Mr. TYDINGS. The figures which I have given represent deferments under the Tydings amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know how many were eligible for military service?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is estimated by General Hershey's office that by December 31, 1943, at the present rate of deferment for all reasons, 3,032,000 men on the farms will be deferred for physical handicaps, dependencies, and preferences under the Tydings amendment.

The figures which I have read—and they have been checked and double-checked—apply to those who have been deferred under the Tydings amendment and in accordance with its provisions.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The figures presented by the Senator from Maryland indicate that considerably more than one-third of all the farmers will be deferred. It is absurd to think that it would be reasonable to have two-thirds of the farmers inducted into the service. There are only 8,500,000 on the farms, and yet he is talking about deferring 3,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 38 who are eligible for military service.

Mr. TYDINGS. It will be found that of the men who will be drafted this year, with the cream already pretty well taken off by men having gone into war plants or into the Army, the deferments for general reasons will run much higher than they have run heretofore. That applies not only to those who come from the country, but those who come from the city as well. Men who were deferred a year or a year and a half ago on the ground of being physically unfit are now being reexamined, and in many instances are being put on the eligible list in order to make up the required quota. So the figures which I have received from Gen-

eral Hershey's office are as accurate and as nearly primary evidence as any which can be adduced from any source in the country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized to discuss the pending bill, but I understand the majority leader wishes to move at this time that the Senate adjourn or recess until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the Senator did not want to proceed with his discussion this afternoon, but desired to obtain recognition for that purpose tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to having that done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Alabama. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I simply want to insert a word of explanation about certain amendments which I propose to offer tomorrow before requesting consent that the amendments be printed and placed on the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, what my amendments propose to do is to set up an over-all authority consisting of what is called a committee on requirements and program, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization, and to make them an over-all committee which, subject to the jurisdiction of the President, would have the duty of allocating the manpower of the Nation among the armed forces and essential civilian production activities, including agriculture, and giving to the chairman of the War Manpower Commission the power to defer those who might be found to be essential civilian workers in industry and in agriculture. The amendments would achieve the essential purpose of the pending bill, but at the same time would set up an over-all agency to deal with the question of allocation of the war manpower resources of the country.

With that word of explanation, I send the amendments to the desk, request that they be printed, be printed in the Record, and that copies of them be placed on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will lie on the table, be printed, and be printed in the Record.

The amendments submitted by Mr. PEPPER are as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. PEPPER to the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, viz: strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"This act may be cited as the Manpower Mobilization Act."

"Sec. 2. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the Committee) under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the Director) and consisting of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. This Committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the program). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The schedules of military and essential civilian production and the manpower quotas relating thereto determined under the program shall be binding upon the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and other war agencies in their determination and operations relating to production and manpower.

"Sec. 3. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

"(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act that occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding to this effect and such findings shall be conclusive upon all civilian local boards and any other civilian agencies functioning under this act. No other occupational deferments shall be granted under this act except upon such a finding by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission;

"(2) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper."

"Sec. 4. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized to provide equipment, transportation, housing, medical facilities, and training to workers being placed in or transferred to war or essential civilian activity, including production of food and other agricultural products whenever he

deems such assistance necessary in order to meet the program.

"Sec. 5. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is hereby authorized to recruit and organize a National Emergency Workers Corps, and to employ the members of such National Emergency Workers Corps for such length of time as he may deem their services necessary in order to meet the program. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, with the advice and consent of the Director of Economic Stabilization, is authorized to fix and pay such compensation to the members of the National Emergency Workers Corps as he deems necessary and proper after adequate public hearings; such compensation shall be fixed with due regard to the availability of such labor, the compensation to labor in alternative employment, the policies of the Director of Economic Stabilization and such other circumstances as may be deemed necessary and proper by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the Director of Economic Stabilization. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall make the members of such National Emergency Workers Corps available to agricultural producers and other employers engaged in essential activity whenever he deems such action necessary in order to meet the program: *Provided*, That such employers shall reimburse the War Manpower Commission for such labor at amounts to be determined by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission with the advice and consent of the Director of Economic Stabilization which are determined by them to be reasonable and proper in relation to previous and present costs of labor and to the necessity of achieving the essential production involved.

"Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to the War Manpower Commission to carry out the purposes of section 4 of this act.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$200,000,000 to the War Manpower Commission to be used as a revolving fund to carry out the activities authorized under section 5 of this act. The compensation to be paid by employers accepting the services of the members of the National Emergency Workers Corps shall be paid to the War Manpower Commission for use in this revolving fund.

"Sec. 7. There is hereby created a Board of War Mobilization under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of four representatives of agriculture, four representatives of industry, four representatives of labor, and four public members at large appointed by the President. The Board shall hold regular meetings at least once a month. The Board shall make to the Director and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Food Administrator all of whom shall advise and consult with the Board on all major policies of manpower mobilization, such recommendations relating to policy and operation as it may deem will improve production and manpower mobilization."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide maximum mobilization of manpower for the war effort, including manpower for the military forces and for essential military and civilian production."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I have received from Mr. George O. Rafert, of Fortville, Ind., a letter which bears so pointedly upon the topic under discussion that I request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, so that it may be available to the Senators who are studying the problem.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTVILLE, IND., March 8, 1943.

Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: * * * My interest is not in politics but in my 350-acre farm and in the problem of farm labor. Incidentally I am the Indiana farmer who wrote the article *A Farmer and His Troubles*, which was published in the United States News in their issue of December 25, 1942, and which was subsequently read to the House on January 8, 1943, by Representative CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan, and is in full in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A54. This article gives our exact experiences on this farm during the past year and the reasons for the impending food shortage just as I can see them developing right here on the farm.

Here on my farm our normal crew was five men, two hired men, my two sons, and myself. Now there are just two of us including myself, age 59. The factories took our two hired men and the draft took one of my sons. Where we formerly put 350,000 to 400,000 pounds of corn-fed beef on the Indianapolis yards in a year we can now feed no cattle at all due to lack of labor. To feed that many cattle required the daily handling of from 14 to 16 tons of material every day and two of us cannot do this as only one of the jobs of a large farm. Last year we produced 260 tons of tomatoes for canning. This year we cannot do half of that unless we get help. Last year we produced a crop of canning peas. This year we cannot even plant them. We expected to produce upward of 1,000 head of hogs this year but will not run much over 500 head. Last year we had 70 acres of soybeans and 65 acres of corn. What we can do this year remains to be seen. The reason in each case is the same—lack of labor.

In our situation, located as we are about midway between the industrial centers of Indianapolis and Anderson, we simply cannot hire labor for we cannot compete with the 8-hour day and over a dollar an hour and overtime. We are fully mechanized and equipped but our equipment will not run itself. There is no longer any question but what the situation is very serious and that something will have to be done to place labor on our farms. The question is what to do.

In such a large country as this and with such a variety of crops and climate and agricultural methods, it is evident that the solution of the farm-labor problem is not to be found in any one answer. In picking cotton in the South, a battery of soldiers acting as such might be of use but we cannot feed cattle or raise hogs with a battery of soldiers.

In some areas it is conceivable that boys of from 14 to 17 might be of some use but we cannot trust high-priced and complicated equipment with inexperienced boys, especially when we cannot replace the equipment and in fact can hardly get repairs. Besides, any boys of that age who have been raised on the farm and have some experience are already working there. The same is already true of our womenfolk. If it had not been for my wife and my daughters we would not have had a tomato crop even last year.

In our area we must plan our program ahead as definitely as a production line is planned and this planning must be based on the knowledge that we will have dependable skilled and experienced labor 7 days a week. In our situation there is only one answer and I write to you in the hope that you may implement legislation to make this one answer possible.

I have a son in the Army. As a matter of plain horse sense I know that he would be worth many times as much to the Nation if he were here on this farm. He knows

every foot of this land for he was raised on it. He knows our machinery and our methods and would need no training. He was part of a productive team which was broken down when the draft took him away. He has not produced a single thing in the 17 months he has been in the Army. Here at home with the equipment available to his use he could this year produce enough food to feed the entire regiment of which he is now a part, for the entire year. Now, the only answer and the only solution which will meet the labor problem on this and thousands of farms like this, is to furlough experienced individual farmers back to the land from which they came.

The draft stripped our farms and the only way to correct the mistake is to back-track on the draft and put these individual experienced farmers who are now in the Army, back on the land from which they came and with which they are already familiar and acquainted.

It should not be difficult to implement legislation to accomplish this purpose.

I ask that you present this idea to the Senate or to such committee as in your judgment will give this solution the recognition that I know you will agree it should have. I send this to you because I do not know where else to send it to be assured that it will be effectively used. Regardless of what solutions may be presented to meet the needs of farmers in other sections of the country, this is the only real solution which will meet our need here in the Corn Belt and in the area devoted to the feeding of cattle and the raising of hogs. The Army took our experienced farmers and we will have to go to the Army to get them back. Lack of labor on our farms could lose this war a whole lot quicker than lack of soldiers in the Army. This is just plain sense. Something has to be done now or it will be too late for planting time is at hand.

I am sure that you will find Representative SPRINGER and many others in both the House and the Senate fully ready to cooperate. I thank God that we have a Congress again.

I would appreciate your personal reply.

Yours very truly,

GEO. O. RAFERT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that the figures which the Senator has given would be much more impressive to me and to other Senators if he were to state in terms of percentage the number of persons who have been deferred for farm labor, as compared with the number of those who have been sent into the armed forces. Can the Senator obtain such figures?

Mr. TYDINGS. Between now and tomorrow I shall endeavor to obtain the figures showing the number of persons who have gone from the farms into the armed forces and the number of those who have been deferred.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to have the Senator obtain for us the figures showing the total number of those who have entered the armed services during the period covered by the figures which the Senator has given us, and also the figures showing the number of those who have been deferred. Then we shall know what percentage of the persons selected for service have been deferred to work on the farms, as compared with the total number of persons entering the military

service. I think such information would be quite helpful.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it would be; and in order to make the picture complete, I think we should obtain information as to the number of persons who have been deferred to work in industry; because the point of the proposition is that a man working on a farm is working in a war industry, and I do not think we want to defer those in one group and not defer those in another.

My State is an industrial State, not a farm State; so I cannot be accused of having any bias in the matter.

Mr. WALSH. The point I desire to make is that we should have sufficient information to give us the entire picture. Information as to the total number deferred does not present such a picture. We want to have information as to the number deferred to go into industrial work, as compared to the number deferred to go into farm work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, when General Hershey was before our committee he said that 804,000 agricultural workers had been inducted into the armed services.

Now, Mr. President, with the understanding, as previously stated, that I shall have the privilege of having the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow, I yield to the majority leader so that we may conclude the session this afternoon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Harold E. Montamat, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, also to be a consul; and

Several persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, also to be consuls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, nominations under the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER AT LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the desk from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads a favorable report on the nomination of Mr. Frank F. Garside to be postmaster at Las Vegas, Nev. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be taken up and considered out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Nevada has spoken to me today about the matter, and has made out a very strong case for immediate consideration of the nomination. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank F. Garside to be postmaster at Las Vegas, Nev.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1938.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

Charlotte E. Carr to be assistant to the Deputy Chairman at \$6,500 per annum.

Wallace P. Studencki to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum, Chicago regional office.

Stephen R. MacRae to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

Bernard L. Gorfinkle to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

Russell C. McCarthy to be area director at \$5,600 per annum, Rochester area office.

Olaf K. Fjetland to be area director at \$4,600 per annum, Saginaw area office.

Wilberforce D. Simmons to be senior manpower utilization consultant at \$4,600 per annum, New York regional office.

Luke White to be senior attorney at \$4,600 per annum in the office of the General Counsel.

Paul N. Devine to be area director at \$4,600 per annum, New Bedford-Fall River area office.

James K. Johnson to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum, Cleveland regional office.

Grafton L. Brown to be field supervisor at \$4,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Nannie L. Connevey, Bauxite.
S. Tillman Tipton, Biggers.
Harmon T. Griffin, Lake City.
Sue M. Brown, Luxora.
Maud Jackson, Sherrill.
Fred W. Knickerbocker, Sparkman.

NEVADA

Frank F. Garside, Las Vegas.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence H. Rosebro, Cleveland.
French W. Graham, Elkin.
William D. Coble, Guilford College.
Frederick R. Jones, Hayesville.
John V. Highfill, Mayodan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou who at the creation looked on all Thy works as good, give us an expanding experience in the school of our Saviour. Breathe Thy valiant spirit into our quiet breasts that we may wait and not be weary. Pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of compassion, the very bond of peace and of all virtues.

In a world which nourishes in its bewildered brain that unquenched, deep-sunken sin of hate, quicken us with the spirit of the Christ, for spiritual communion, and it shall be well with us when the rain descends and the wind blows. As we behold and glorify Thee as infinite goodness, help us to live in the spirit of entire consecration. As servants of our great land, inspire us to spread the mantle of the crescent hope of promise near and far, lifting man to the high levels of our historic freedom. In the approaching days of humility, repentance, and meditation, do Thou arm us with the conviction that there is nothing better in all the universe than building a sacrificial civilization. It shall tower above the wrecks of time, declaring that its riches, honor, and glory cannot die. In the name of Him who spake as never man spake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution condemning outrages inflicted upon civilians in the Nazi occupied countries and favoring punishment of persons responsible therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1749. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 133) entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and Mr. McNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therewith a statement made on a bill pending before the Rivers and Harbors Committee by Mr. Roy Miller, of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HENDRICKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION PLEDGED TO PRICE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an article written by Mr. Stettinius, appearing in the April issue of the American magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a memorial passed by the Indiana State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHAT CONSTITUTES SEDITION?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] from the Well of the House said:

Whatever else may be said of Premier Stalin, he is for Russia first, and he does not hesitate to say so. Whatever may be said of Prime Minister Churchill, he is for Great Britain first, and has said frankly that he "was not chosen Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." I admire them for their frankness, for I can truthfully say that my first interest is the welfare of the United States of America.

Every true American should, in my opinion, agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that our first interest is the welfare of the United States of America.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me issue a warning to the gentleman from Mississippi. He had better watch his step because one William Power Maloney, recently promoted by the Attorney General to the office of chief of staff in charge of Federal prosecutions, last summer caused an indictment to be returned in which an organization known as America First was named as one of the agencies used by individuals who were indicted as seditionists.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the danger he is in from this man Maloney, who has indicted people who have, in Maloney's opinion, voiced too loudly their faith in America, their belief that America should come first.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received by a constituent, the Honorable Haymond Maxwell, Sr., formerly a member of the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, relative to the attitude of O. P. A. toward small wholesalers engaged in the meat industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AID TO VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1749) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 as amended, with Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That Paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: 'World War II—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term "active military or naval service," as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War II cases."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this amendment does?

Mr. RANKIN. This amendment merely adds the WAAC's.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It just simply brings the women's auxiliaries into the law?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; the other women's organizations are already included. There is a bill pending before the House to put this Women's Auxiliary Army Corps on the same status.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We passed this legislation unanimously the other day?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it was passed unanimously. The bill was taken up in the Senate and this is the only amendment adopted. We have a great many of these boys coming back who are shell-shocked or nervous wrecks, due to the strenuous activities on every front. They go home and are broken down and are often discharged because of some disability that probably was manifest before they entered the service. It is leaving large numbers of these boys who are en-

titled to hospitalization and who are now being sent to jails and are being sent home, without adequate care, and we are providing that we hospitalize them just as we did the veterans of the First World War.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that it is very essential and it is necessary to have it done as quickly as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This legislation is long overdue. We passed it last year?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; this legislation is long overdue.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. This has nothing to do with the resolution pending before the Rules Committee as to the jurisdiction over the Second World War veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. SABATH. This has to do merely with hospitalization; is that right?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. By the way, when is the gentleman going to give us a vote on that resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is simply to provide something that is very important to enable the veterans of this war to obtain the hospitalization facilities of those hospitals under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember some weeks ago I received a letter from the commandant of the soldiers' home in Chelsea, Mass., Mr. Quigley, who has been interested in this legislation. This is to give to the veterans of this war the advantages of hospitalization the same as World War veterans in hospitals under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to commend the gentleman's committee on the action taken.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Of course, in the present war there are more cases of mental disorders resulting from shell shock and high explosives than there ever was in any other war. In my State we have a statute which requires that when a man is sent to an asylum for the insane his estate is responsible for the charges and cost of keeping him there. The Army has been taking men who have lost their mental capacity down there to the county court in custody of a guard, turned them over to the local court for disposition, then they will be assigned to the asylum for treatment. Will this bill cover a case

of that kind and permit those men to be sent to a veterans' hospital instead of a State hospital?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what it is for. May I say to the gentleman from Kentucky and to the Members of the House, someone called attention to the fact yesterday that more men are killed in proportion to the ones who receive bullet wounds in this war than in any other war, because they are using heavy explosives. They are using powerful guns and they are using airplanes. This is the first war in which the United States has lost an admiral, and I can give the names of four admirals that we have already lost. Some of these men are literally blown to pieces on ships, and where they have survived without visible wounds, many of them are so shocked, they are physically unable to carry on, yet I have known cases where their disabilities have been attributed to some mental or physical weakness that they had manifested years ago. This bill is to take care of those men just as we did the ones who served in the last World War.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Are we to understand this is confined exclusively to hospitalization and has nothing to do with pensions, allowances for rent and other things to the women's organizations?

Mr. RANKIN. This is hospitalization only.

Mr. THOMASON. Nothing but hospitalization?

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This covers cases similar to two which have arisen in my district in the last couple of weeks where veterans came back, had no place to go, fell on the street, and the police had to take care of them?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; where they are discharged for disability.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Some complaint has been made to the effect that possibly a number of these boys have been inducted into the service who have been inoculated, we will say, for different kinds of diseases and as a result of inferior serum or for some other reason or cause they have become mentally disabled, and have been discharged from the service on account of a disability that existed prior to entering the service.

I know of two cases where men were in there, one for 18 months and another 2 years. After the war they became partly disabled and had to take serum of different kinds. I wonder if men in that situation would be taken care of.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they would be hospitalized.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if there are other bills pending before his committee which go more extensively into the matter of the rehabilitation of the soldiers of this war?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; such a bill is pending before the House. Our committee has already reported it. But that is a different bill from this one.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

By unanimous consent, a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Cannon, Fla.	Lea	Slaughter
Clason	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, W. Va.
Cochran	Luce	Starnes, Ala.
Culkin	McGranery	Stewart
Davis	McGregor	Treadway
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Domeneaux	Nichols	Whelchel, Ga.
Gavin	O'Connor	White
Gibson	O'Toole	Whitten
Harris, Va.	Reece, Tenn.	Winter
Hinshaw	Schuetz	
Hope	Sheridan	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 155) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby made available to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 121 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, the unexpended balance of the amount heretofore appropriated to the said committee by House Resolution 306 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This resolution simply appropriates the unexpended balance the committee had left last year?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that only \$10,000 was made available last year for this purpose. This resolution simply authorizes the expenditure for the same purpose of the amount remaining of the original \$10,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The House has every confidence in the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING LEASE-LEND ACT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1501, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the bill had been read and was subject to amendment. Amendments are now in order.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: At the end of line 11 change the period to a comma and insert the following:

"And that subsection (b) of section 3 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory, but after June 30, 1943, any final determination of benefits to be provided to the United States shall be subject to approval by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is section 3 (b) of the present Lend-Lease Act with the following words added:

But after June 30, 1943, any final determination of the benefits to be provided to

the United States shall be subject to approval by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

The words "final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States" are taken from article VII of the 10 master lease-lend agreements.

For the text of article VII, see page 1656 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, or page 72 of the Stettinius report.

The form of post-war organization of the world is dimly growing. We do not know what it will be. It has almost infinite possibilities for good or evil. We know now two things: first, we must be a part of that organization, or it will fail; and, second, no matter what part we take in any world organization, if we do not preserve our Republic at home, we shall have lost the war.

In our Republic the Executive has vast powers and responsibilities to plan and negotiate for peace, but the people's representatives must pass upon post-war plans.

The act we are extending gives the Commander in Chief enormous powers to arrange mutual war aid. These powers are not disturbed by this amendment.

Section 3 (b) of the act, however, is construed by the Executive to authorize certain agreements of a permanent nature settling forever the balance of benefits between our country and our allies. Such agreements have already been made. We have 17 secret lend-lease agreements with our South American neighbors in which the materials to be delivered and the amount of reimbursement, the final determination of benefits, have already been settled.

This amendment would not disturb these agreements. The 10 master agreements, however, look forward to final settlements involving vast economic commitments. On pages 13 and 14 of our committee report you will find the section headed "Procedure for determination of benefits," in which the committee attempted to give you a summary of the functions of the Executive and the Congress under lend-lease procedure. While it is recognized that treaties must be ratified by the Senate, and the Congress must implement any course of action by appropriations, you will find these words on page 14:

The proposals for forward action in the economic field contemplated by article VII must be handled by—

Among other methods—
executive agreements.

That is, forward action in the economic field under lend-lease as it now stands may be handled by executive agreements. In the past we have had many executive agreements with other nations by authority of acts of Congress, which did not require further approval by Congress or ratification by the Senate. Agreements for suspension of tariffs, international copyrights, postal conventions, and boundary disputes are examples of executive agreements made under authority of law which are not submitted to Congress or the Senate.

This amendment tests whether we wish to authorize the President by executive agreements to determine the final benefits we shall receive from our war aid. This amendment does not affect past final agreements. It does not tie the hands of the President in furnishing war aid. Under the first phrase of section 3 (b), he can still give away munitions if he so desires. We know now that we can expect little by way of direct payment in money, goods, or services, as benefits from the war. We know that the primary benefit will be the winning of the war, but there are other benefits which are already contemplated in the economic field under section 7 of the 10 master agreements which involve great changes in our domestic economy. Congress should retain a voice in what these changes are to be.

This amendment does not hamper the President in formulating or negotiating other types of post-war benefits. It simply carries out the tradition of our Republic in foreign affairs—the President proposes and Congress disposes. It clarifies for us and for the world the domestic post-war plan for this Republic. It would clear up a twilight zone and remove the possibility of future arguments.

Under our Constitution, Congress has many checks on the President, and the President has many checks on Congress, but the Constitution does not and cannot force the Executive and the Congress to go forward together. That must be done by the men who hold office under the Constitution. Cooperation is needed. This amendment cannot legislate cooperation. No law can do this. This amendment provides, however, the machinery for cooperation, if both Houses pass this amendment, and the bill is approved by the President. We will then have set up the machinery for teamwork in the post-war field. This cooperation means that Congress must be sufficiently advised of developments and negotiations and agreements in our foreign affairs to act wisely and promptly. Developing our foreign policy is primarily the responsibility of the Executive, but Congress must keep sufficiently advised to act wisely and promptly. This amendment does not authorize meddling by the Congress. On the other hand, no law can prevent meddling by Congress. It is with the hope that we can take steps now to set up machinery to prevent the ghastly battles between the Congress and the Executive that followed the Versailles Treaty that I urge the House to take this step today.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman read from page 14 of the report. I think the gentleman should have started the reading from the fifth line, at the end of the fifth line, with the word "confident"—

Confident that it is the intent of the Congress as well as the administration that the constitutional procedure pursued since the beginning of our Government shall continue to prevail, your committee stands ready to cooperate in any and every effort to achieve a peace which shall bless us and our descendants.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. When I read it I said, "among other things." I did not have time to read all of the very interesting and deeply thought over and fought over wording of the section on procedure for determination of benefits, and no Member of this body can fully understand this amendment or the problems that lie in the immediate future, or the part that executive agreements may play, even though traditional methods are used, unless he reads the report. There is also a traditional method of executive agreements authorized by law.

Mr. BLOOM. It is a matter of fact that similar propositions were brought up in the committee to those on page 14 in the report.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The reason such great care was taken in drafting this paragraph of the report was that the committee was most anxious to state to the House the present status of this law with reference to the powers and functions of Congress and the Executive, and to restate for the House the assurances from the Executive we had received as to how the law was to be administered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw the point of order?

Mr. BLOOM. Do I have to press it at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may reserve it.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I have reserved a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much convinced that this is about the most dangerous amendment that could possibly be adopted by the House.

As has been said to the House before, there are 4 types of agreements. The 17 special agreements with the South American countries; the 10 master agreements with our allies; the special agreements made with Great Britain with respect to the maintenance of our troops abroad; and also the agreements with respect to our rights to the patents and processes and secret formulas of the British Government. In addition to that, the waiver of our maritime rights and the waiver of maritime rights by Great Britain.

Let us take up first what effect this amendment would have with respect to the special agreements that have been entered into with the 17 South American countries. In the first place, the final determination of those agreements has been made insofar as what the commitments of this country shall be and the commitments of the South American countries shall be, although the terms of

the agreements have not been finally consummated. The agreements are secret and confidential in their nature. The terms of those agreements have not yet been made public. In other words, if a proviso such as is proposed here had been in the act, the Government of the United States could not under any circumstances have entered into binding agreements with any of those 17 South American countries, because the agreements would not have been binding until approved by the Congress of the United States by a concurrent resolution.

So in what position would we be with the South American countries? We would have made no progress whatsoever with respect to getting their cooperation in the defense of our Nation and the Western Hemisphere. That shows you how we would have to act in the future if we adopted this proviso.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I refuse to yield at this time. The amendment provides that all agreements must have the approval, by concurrent resolution, of the Congress of the United States. Now, everybody knows that it will be absolutely necessary, as we go forward in our march toward victory, to make further agreements. Maybe additional agreements with the South American countries, the Central American countries and even with the countries of Europe and Asia, and they will be secret and confidential. So we would tie the hands of the State Department and the President insofar as negotiations are concerned in making agreements for the future, if we adopt this amendment effective June 3. It would simply hamstring the State Department in developing understandings with other countries.

Insofar as the master agreements are concerned, they are somewhat in the nature of a statement of broad principles, or broad objectives, but there are some commitments made in them with respect to the considerations which will enter into the negotiations. To a certain extent, those master agreements are final commitments, but not in all respects. From the lend-lease operations everybody knows that all of the United Nations are getting some benefits, and the United States expects to get some benefits in return. Maybe in the political field; maybe in the field of international trade and commerce; maybe in the field of security for our own Nation. How are you going to embody those benefits in a resolution to be approved concurrently by the House and Senate?

Many of those benefits will be set forth in treaties that this country will enter into with other countries of the world—with our friends. How can we insert a clause here that the House of Representatives must approve the treaty? It is useless; it is impossible; it is contrary to the Constitution; it would tie the hands of the Chief Executive and the State Department. In addition, it would make every country with whom we were dealing say, "Well, we cannot take a chance on that. We cannot make any agreement with you, or make any final commitment, because it will have to go to

the Congress of the United States. It will become public. We do not know what you are going to do." You would simply tie the hands of the State Department and the President. It may sound nice for the House to have a great deal more authority with respect to treaties, and with respect to holding down the State Department, insofar as making commitments is concerned; but why should we not depend on constitutional processes? Whatever is necessary to be approved by the Senate will be done that way. Whatever legislation is necessary in order for this country to go forward in the field of economic action must of necessity come before the House. By adopting something broad like this proposed amendment we are trying to change the Constitution. Changing the Constitution might not be so bad, but, what is worse, you would simply defeat the purposes of the Lend-Lease Act and throw a direct obstacle in the path of winning this war.

Those South American countries will certainly not make any secret agreements in the future with us if there is any such provision in this act. Take the matter of the special agreements with the countries with respect to the maintenance of our troops overseas. Final agreements have been made on that—practically final determinations in some respects. Those agreements have not been made public. Are you going to say to General Eisenhower in Africa, "You cannot make any final agreement with any regime over there because the Congress will have to approve it?" What position would he be in when he comes to negotiate?

Now, take the agreement with respect to patent rights and with respect to secret formulas and processes and radio information, and all those things, which are confidential with respect to military movements and things like that.

I do not think we want to bring that before the Congress, so far as any agreement is concerned, and discuss it. It would be simply impossible. This amendment sounds nice. You know it would be nice for each Member of Congress to feel: "Well, we took on a little extra authority today; we are going to oversee what the State Department does; we are going to oversee what the military commanders are doing in these foreign fields so they may not do anything wrong; we have taken a little authority back to the Congress of the United States. We are doing a very fine thing." Instead, it seems to me we ought to give a little deeper and more careful consideration to ultimate effects when these catch-phrase amendments are offered; when appeals are made to our vanity that we, the Congress, should control everything, and that this is a democratic form of government or a republican form of government; so why not?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. With pleasure.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The amendment was carefully considered in the committee, was it not—considered from every angle—and it was deemed

unwise not only now but unwise for the future; that it would be impractical to work out and that it would defeat the very purposes of this act in frightening governments from making any agreements? Is not that a fact?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understood that the discussion of the action of a committee in executive session was out of order on the floor of the House.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I merely said the amendment was considered.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the action of the committee in executive session is to be discussed I would want to discuss it, too, but I understand that such discussion is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The only thing I said about the committee was that it was carefully considered in the committee and the conclusion now is, as the gentleman has so well stated, that it would be a highly prejudicial amendment in the execution of this law afterward and during the time it is in effect, and also as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has so well stated, it would prevent us from making agreements with reference to carrying on this war, if we add the amendment as part of the law.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We should not try to include some authority to the House which the House cannot have; we should not take any action that requires final approval by this House of every little agreement that the military want to make or the State Department wants to make or any agency of the United States Government wants to make.

What position would General Eisenhower be in over in Africa if any agreement he made over there with respect to final commitments had to come back to Congress? Again, I say, under the terms of the proposed amendment, he could not enter into any agreement without its coming back here and being discussed, and he would have to wait many, many months, perhaps, before the Congress would act.

Mr. CASE and Mr. VORYS of Ohio rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman does not want to say that he believes that the language which gives Congress power only over final determination of benefits covers every little agreement that General Eisenhower or the President may make?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Certainly.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not perfectly clear that the whole broad field of executive agreement is left intact by this amendment?

Mr. EBERHARTER. General Eisenhower will have to feed French troops

over there in Africa, perhaps under lend-lease, yet any final settlement of any agreement he made to that effect would have to have the approval of Congress in the last analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. EATON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. EATON. In order to make an observation, I shall have to rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, as a simple layman I humbly apologize for not being equipped intellectually to follow the devious course of these profound legal arguments. I can understand why the lawyers here and the professors turn these amendments over like sweet legalistic morsels; but just as a plain ordinary citizen I should like to record my understanding of the issue before us.

This legislation involves one, and only one, proposal, namely, to extend the operations of the original Lend-Lease Act for 1 year. That is all. Why it should take 2 days of plucking the stars out of the sky and creating dust storms of controversy here I cannot understand.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman believe that this resolution should not be amended?

Mr. EATON. These Democrats have a disconcerting habit of jumping right in ahead of one. Yes; that is the purpose for which I rose to make this statement.

Why can we not now pass this legislation as is and get rid of the thing? I recognize and respect the purpose and patriotism of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] in offering this amendment. He is a profound student of these questions, and I agree with him in his desire to protect the Constitution of the United States and the security of our people in this and every other way. But this bill is a simple matter. It can be disposed of by rational beings in a short time. Then these profound problems, constitutional and economic, that are raised by these proposed amendments—and there are many of them pending—can be, and ought to be, taken up as separate legislation and handled on their own merits and discussed upon grounds that inhere in such legislation itself. For this reason I want to go on record as hoping that there will be no amendments to this resolution; that we shall pass it now and not bog it down in a maze of complicated procedure.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]?

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

Mr. BLOOM. I want to try to arrange for time on this amendment.

Mr. DEWEY. It will not be taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has been recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked unanimous consent to have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I particularly regret that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will not permit me to proceed for 5 additional minutes as I contemplated.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield? I asked the gentleman from Illinois if he would yield to me a half minute so that I could make a request as to time.

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLOOM. And the gentleman from Illinois refused. That is why I did.

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the gentleman's speaking 10 minutes or 15 minutes or a half hour as far as that is concerned, but I want to see if we cannot arrange a definite amount of time to be consumed for debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. May I ask the leader of the minority if we can agree on time for this amendment? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois and Mr. DIRKSEN objected.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Did the gentleman from Illinois yield for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yielded to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CASE. He yielded for a unanimous-consent request, as I understood it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that inasmuch as I asked the gentleman to yield for a unanimous-consent request I should not have made that motion at this time, so I withdraw it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the orderly thing to do is to let the gentleman from Illinois proceed, inasmuch as his time is running, and then at the conclusion of his remarks see if we can work out some agreement as to time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes inasmuch as 2 minutes of my time has already been consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, the subject of my address may at first appear not germane to the consideration of the extension of the Lend-Lease Act, but if my distinguished colleagues will bear with me for a few moments, I believe they will agree that there is a close connection between the operations of lend-lease and that period of world reconstruction which will follow our victory.

While not a member of the so-called debt-funding commission which by act of Congress reconsidered and drafted plans for the refunding of the debts of our former allies growing out of the First World War, yet as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, I sat in attendance at many of their meetings and became quite familiar with the history of the debts themselves and their disposition.

I should like to recall to your memory something of the financial history of our country during these First World War days. In the first place, the gross public debt of the United States on June 30, 1917, only two months and one-half after we ourselves entered the war, amounted to but \$2,975,000,000, and until March 1913, when the income-tax system was first put into operation, our fellow citizens had been subjected to no taxes except those imposed by the tariff acts and a few excise taxes on liquor, playing cards, and tobacco. In the next 2 years that followed, two great changes occurred. In the first place, our public debt increased to the sum of \$25,000,000,000 on June 30, 1919, and we became one of the great creditor nations of the earth. Further, under the revenue bill of 1918 the top brackets of the personal income tax were over 75 percent and hundreds of excise taxes had been added, and our people for the first time became tax conscious.

The history of that period parallels quite closely the period through which

we are now passing. The so-called war debts of the First World War, brought into being by our extension of credit for war materials for our allies, can be compared to lend-lease operations, and while taxes have been on the increase for the last 10 years, yet it was only the 1942 act that has reached almost all of our citizens. Hence, I think that we may reasonably anticipate the same reaction among our fellow citizens after the coming victory that occurred after our victory in the First World War. It is this similar reaction that we must fend against by careful thought and planning at the present time.

Again to revert to history, you will recall President Wilson's 14 points and that controversial and toothless organization, the League of Nations.

Mr. Wilson's 14 points and the League of Nations were devised to insure those same world-wide aspirations as the "four freedoms." I cannot help but believe that the American public's repudiation of further international cooperation after the First World War, and the achievement of the ideals for which that war was fought, was due to the lack of the existence of a practical and understandable approach to the solution of the post-war problems.

Today, guided by this knowledge and experience, it behooves us to begin now to give some thought and study that we may not fall again into the same errors. I think of two of the "four freedoms"—freedom from want and freedom from fear. We are fighting to achieve these. Once achieved we have the duty to take practical steps for their maintenance, lest the public again repudiate their own achievements because they have not been made practical and real.

These two emotions, fear and want, were brought forcibly to the American public by the persecution of the Jewish people in Germany by Hitler and persecutions of other minorities. Their plight engaged my attention in 1937 and I attempted a practical solution of the problem through a bank of international cooperation. I was familiar with the situation that then surrounded the First World War debt, all of which had been defaulted, due to the impossibility of the debtor nations obtaining sufficient foreign exchange with which to purchase dollars to make payment on account of principal and interest of the loans, which at that time amounted to about \$10,000,000,000. As the debts appeared uncollectible I conceived the idea of making a composition of them by which 90 percent would be more or less forgiven and the balance of 10 percent be paid in the currencies of the debtor countries as a capital of the bank.

In view of our forgiveness of 90 percent of the debts, the debtor nations in purchasing their stock in the bank would turn over 51 percent of their shares to the United States Government and retain for their own account 49 percent. This bank then, with the capital of \$1,000,000,000 and with the right to sell its debentures in the markets of the world, would have been in the position to grant long-term credits for the opening of new territories throughout the world in which the persecuted people might find a new

home and an opportunity to restart their life with a hope of achieving, at least in part, the two ideals of freedom from want and freedom from fear. At the time the plan was introduced at a round table at the Brookings Institution and considerable interest was exhibited in it from various places; but, unfortunately, the drums of this war commenced to sound in the year 1938 before anything concrete could be accomplished and the plan for the moment had to be set aside.

On February 17 of this year I appeared before the important Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and presented to my distinguished colleagues of that committee a revised plan for this bank of international cooperation. This new bank has the same conceptions and ideals—that of implementing in a practical and understandable way two of the "four freedoms" of our declared objectives—freedom from want and freedom from fear. We cannot, however, any longer use the debts of the First World War as a means of obtaining our capital. They are snowed under with too many other layers of more recent indebtedness. A lesson we have learned from the present conflict is the importance of critical materials. It is to these I look to supply our capital.

The United States is possessed of about three-fourths of the total world supply of one commodity for which, in the settlement of international balances between countries, no substitute of equal worth has ever been found. This commodity is gold and will always be one of the critical materials. The other commodities which have proven to be critical materials are most numerous and are found throughout the nations of the world. For example I mention but a few—tin, quinine, and manganese ore. These critical materials, including our gold, shall represent the purchase price of the capital of the new bank of international cooperation.

Now let us consider for a moment what will be the purpose and duty of this bank once established. In the first place, the United States Government will pay in its share from its gold hoard, and this metal will hence be put back into international circulation. For those persons who fear that gold will never again take its place in the settlement of international balances, may I recall the effort made on the part of Hitler and Herr Dr. Schacht, president of the German Reichsbank, to obtain control of the gold stock of every nation the German Army has invaded. Schacht well knew that despite his policy of international barter in trade, the world at large could absorb only a certain quantity of German mouth organs and cheap cameras when the point of saturation would be reached, and the sellers of the things that Germany wanted would not dispose of them except for gold. The bank of international cooperation must be supplied with this metal with which to make loans that the wheels of international trade may again be put in motion.

For those of the United Nations who have long since been bereft of their gold holdings, there remains the power to

purchase shares in the bank of international cooperation by the delivery of accepted critical materials which will be stock-piled in the United States, where the bank must also be located. I even go so far as to believe that the stock control should be in the possession of the United States Government. Once the capital-stock purchases have been completed, this institution, being possessed of gold and critical materials, will be in a position to grant long-term loans for post-war reconstruction purposes, and out of the large supply of critical materials under its control will be able to regulate the price and the purposes for which the critical materials will be used.

It is my firm belief that, had there been control of nickel, tungsten, chromite, and manganese during the past few years, neither Germany, Japan, nor Italy would have been able to build up the secret armament that confronted the United Nations at the outbreak of the war.

It is my conception that the bank of international cooperation would serve to guarantee and to make real at least two of the four freedoms, freedom from want, by extending credit with which the tools of work may be provided; and freedom from fear, by control of critical materials that henceforth they may be used for the purposes of industry and the arts and not converted secretly for the preparation of another war.

The question naturally arises as to the nature of the organization of such a bank. It is my conception that it should be kept as far from political influence as possible; and while the capital stock of the bank will be owned by the Governments of the various United Nations, yet the purposes and policies of the bank should be directed in the first instance toward world rehabilitation and to the establishment, as a result of world rehabilitation, of the flow of international trade. To achieve this, it would be advisable to have a policy board of directors chosen by each nation from among its own nationals who might be classified as world citizens. The test of a world citizen is one who has reached such a point of public recognition in his own profession as to be above selfish and local prejudices. This policy board would devise programs for the purposes of rehabilitation as outlined above.

A second board of administration should be composed of technicians, men who have had experience in international trade, the making of international contracts, and in foreign exchange. In other words, once a policy was laid out, the technical board would supervise its being put into effect along sound and established lines of procedure, and they would have the further duty, due to the use of the loaning facilities of the bank, of stabilizing foreign currencies.

When I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of the distinguished members interrogated me as to the practicability of operating such a bank without some form of international government to which it might turn in case of controversy. I would suppose that as a result of the peace there will be some form of international policing of

the world, but aside from that I would like to recall that during the period following the first World War the stabilization of currencies and the rehabilitation of devastated countries was attempted, and indeed quite successfully, through the agencies of the central banks of issue of the several nations of the world. As a matter of fact, there even exists today the Bank of International Settlement at Basle, Switzerland, which attempted through its operation and the extension of gold credits to stabilize currencies. Stabilization loans were also made for rehabilitation purposes through the united efforts of the central banks of issue. There was much cooperation between the heads of these banks and complete trust and understanding existed.

The results of all this semi-informal cooperation were extensive and much can be learned from their experiences, but I believe that had they all been brought together in one international banking organization, such as I propose, their efforts might have been crowned with greater success and they might have had a greater influence in preventing the secret armament of the Axis Powers by prohibiting the use of critical materials for armament purposes.

In the brief period I have at my disposition I can go no further than draw the picture of the bank of international cooperation in very broad strokes, but I think that it is germane to the subject of lease-lend and most worthy of consideration at this time.

In order that study may be given to this subject and other subjects of kindred nature that pertain to the rehabilitation period that must face us, I have offered House Resolution 143, which has been referred to the Committee on Rules. This resolution creates a special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Reconstruction, to be composed of 14 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker. It shall be the duty of this committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic problems, to gather information, plans, and suggestions with respect to such problems and to report to the Congress from time to time the results of the findings made.

I believe that it will be found upon detailed study that such an organization as the bank of international cooperation might be the vehicle through which opportunity would be provided, in the larger sense, for returning soldiers to go back to work and to receive the tools with which to start their endeavors. I think that such a bank might provide the loans out of which new territories throughout the world could be opened up for settlement and development. This bank would in no way attempt to supersede or compete with domestic commercial banks. It would open roads that would be too hazardous for private capital to travel until they had been firmly established. In fact, I think a bank of international cooperation can be the solid, practical foundation for the maintenance of at least two of the "four freedoms"—freedom from want and freedom from fear.

I would like to say in closing that I am in favor of the pending bill to extend the Lease-Lend Act for another year and trust it will have the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I understood the gentleman from Illinois to state that the purpose of this lease-lend bill is to implement the "four freedoms." My thought is that the purpose of the lease-lend bill is to assist in the winning of the war.

Mr. DEWEY. The war is being fought to achieve the "four freedoms." That is my general idea. I may have misstated it.

Mr. MICHENER. The "four freedoms" is the objective but I do not think that the Congress thinks today it is voting for legislation to implement the "four freedoms" down through the years.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman and I am very glad he raised that point, because I may have given a misconception, but I believe that part of the fighting of this war is at least to achieve the "four freedoms" and if we let the whole thing drop immediately afterward, we would repudiate our own achievements.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think that our leaders are giving foreign nations a dangerously false impression of the way Americans feel about foreign policy. They remind me of a man my grandfather had who drank too much. Driving my grandfather's carriage through town one day, he waved and shouted to everybody he saw: "Hey there, Bill. Hi! Hi!" My grandfather leaned over and said: "Shut up, Dick. They know you're drunk and they'll think I am too."

It is practically impossible for Americans to feel any lasting prejudice towards the people of any foreign nation, because America is an agglutination of foreign nations all scrambled together and intermarried. Americans look forward to the day, we hope in the near future, when present murderous conflicts may be forgotten like family feuds and all nations may live as peacefully together as the children of many nations and races live together in the streets of our American towns.

War may not be the way to hasten that happy day. Still we feel that, being in it, we must win this war because we dare not let peace be dictated to us by those who seize what does not belong to them. Meanwhile, we send aid to those who are endeavoring to defend their homelands. We have our own war in the Pacific, but we have been persuaded that it is to the interest of America to aid in other wars. We were grateful for money, guns, and soldiers received from foreign countries when our own country was the battleground in 1776 and 1812 and shall be pleased if foreign nations remember the aid we give them today with the same kindly feeling toward us.

We hope that foreign nations understand that it is part of the American system to try to make our leaders do what we want by standing up in public and saying what we think. Often in the heat of the argument we may say things which sound unfriendly to foreign nations but are not intended to be unfriendly. American leaders, talking for political purposes, state that America has been selfish and uncooperative with foreign nations in the past. Such talk is nonsense, as our history books prove. Again, in an effort to further their designs, they talk communistically, saying to foreign nations, "Everything America has is yours." That is equally ridiculous, of course. Most Americans still believe in private property, still believe that private ownership is the hare that makes the hounds go. Besides, charity given by us involuntarily through Government seems to take us nearer to the poorhouse than to heaven.

Thus, the irritating things we say about foreign policy are usually not directed at foreign nations but at our own leaders. Leaders of other nations, we notice, are invariably patriotic, even chauvinistic, in their effort to help their own countries, an attitude we do not disapprove in them. We, on the other hand, seem often to have the bad luck of having leaders who seek to show off and make other countries think that we are richer than we are, creating the illusion that money grows on trees in America, so that naturally foreign nations think that we are rich enough to do more for them than we are able to do, more than they would do for us, under the same circumstances.

We are not really rich yet. America has millions of extremely poor people and relatively few rich ones, though, being proud, we dislike to admit that before foreign nations. One trouble seems to be that, while we have laws and criminal penalties protecting our citizens from private trustees who waste their money, there is nothing in our law to protect the mass of citizens against spendthrifts of money which does not belong to them who find their way into appointive or elective public office, even into Congress—yes, even into the White House. We have not yet learned how to encourage our ablest men to serve in public office. We turn the rascals out at elections and repudiate their acts when and if they come to light. That is the only punishment or remedy present laws provide.

We know that this belated, rather ineffective method of checking our public servants baffles other countries having dealings with us. It may be embarrassing to them again after this war, as after the last, because it is quite likely that if Americans find that their leaders have willfully made commitments, concessions, or donations to foreign nations not reasonably necessary to win the war, leaders will be turned out and their acts repudiated.

You may rely upon it that Americans will never knowingly tolerate nor ratify any acts under lend-lease authority which may turn out to have been done

merely for the purpose of being a good fellow or to elect a fourth-term President or a first president of the united nations of the world. It may take some time to find out and repudiate. We could walk down Main Street and notice how W. P. A. money was being used to win elections. We cannot see how lend-lease money is being spent, for it is being spent far away in other lands where we cannot see it.

Foreign nations should not permit themselves to be misled by the oratory of present American leaders. I suggest to foreign leaders that it is a good idea to test any peace terms that may be suggested not so much by what present leaders may say as by the measuring rod of whether you would consider such a treaty fair to America if you were an average American citizen. Better think up a peace which will be as inexpensive as possible. Remember "Uncle Joe" Cannon, who perhaps expressed America better than anybody, indicted the League of Nations when he hinted it might become a "league of appropriations."

It is also a good idea for people of other countries to remember that, while present leaders may not last long as leaders, the character of the American people changes little from generation to generation. Though proud and independent, it is a just and Christian character. America should be a good friend to try to keep, thanks not so much to any American political leader or party—we have never gotten round to cleaning up our politics—but to the energy, determination, and inherited ambition of the great mass of individual Americans, making it certain that we can and will press on to a higher stage of civilization. We want other nations to go hand in hand with us. We may repudiate radical treaties cooked up virtually overnight the way we did the League of Nations, but gradually—most good things come gradually, and we are still an extremely young nation—we will succeed in earning—notice I do not say "buying," "stealing," "forcing," nor "bribing," I say "earning"—the complete respect and confidence of the entire world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I have counted 16 Members on their feet, and that would be a little less than 4 minutes for each individual.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, make it 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] made the suggestion that perhaps the 17 agreements with South American countries were kept secret and confidential because of jealousies that may exist among the South American countries. Let me say for the information and benefit of the House, that is not the reason that those agreements are kept secret. The South American countries are all joined harmoniously in this united effort. The main reason the agreements are kept secret is the fact that they contain specific commitments, specific provisos, with respect to military installations, naval installations, air-base installations, and that I submit is a very good reason for keeping those agreements secret.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for his accurate and correct statement about that matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I would rather make my own speech.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman would give us a little more information than we have received up to date, I would like to listen to him.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not going to speak upon the matter referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. I am going to talk along another line.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the gentleman will talk on this amendment, so that we may know what it means.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the position taken here and so well expressed by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in asking that the House reject all amendments offered to this bill. That was the conclusion reached by the Foreign Affairs Committee which considered the amendments, and I think it is the part of wisdom now that no amendments should be adopted. There are two reasons for this, but the primary reason is this, that this bill is merely to extend for 1 year a law which has been upon the statute books for 2 years, a law under which agreements have been made, contracts have been made, commitments have been made, and rights have become fixed and vested between our country and other countries of the world. So, it would be highly improper for us now in the middle of the administration of this law, after we have been carrying on under it for 2 years, to stop and make changes in its terms and provisions which might affect agreements heretofore made, and which would affect agreements hereafter made.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. EATON. I would like to have it distinctly understood, Mr. Chairman, that I have absolutely no objection to any of these amendments in and of themselves, but I feel that this one simple bill, if we surround it by a great number of very important and funda-

mental amendments, will not be strong enough to stand the strain, to hold the bundle together.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman is right, and that was the considered judgment of the committee, and I think when you stop to reflect that it is a one-section bill to extend for 1 year a law we have been operating under, that to change its provisions or terms now with reference to contracts or agreements heretofore made, we can well realize what the effect might be. Again, we have now the confidence of our allies, with whom we are fighting, but there is always a question that might be raised in their minds as to whether or not we would carry on, as to whether or not our policy is subject to change or is fixed, and if we should at this time adopt this amendment and say that we have to go back to Congress to have it pass on what has been done, it puts up a signal to our allies which may cause them to lose faith in the fact that the Congress is standing back of the Administration in carrying on this war, and it would make it more difficult to negotiate agreements. I think it would be exceedingly unwise to adopt any amendment, and especially unwise to adopt the amendment now pending.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE. To get a little information: Is it true that some of these other countries with whom these agreements are being made must on their part submit the agreements to their legislative assemblies?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I never heard of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I became very much interested in this amendment yesterday. It would be easy for me to vote for a lend-lease bill without amendment. I am rather enthusiastically for it. But why becloud the issue? Does not the preamble of the master agreement imply that no final determination shall be made until after the full extent of our lend-lease is known? That is the way it reads. This amendment would have nothing to do with temporary arrangements. It refers only to definite agreements of a permanent nature. It can do no harm, but it might do a little good in protecting the rights and duties of Congress in the way of a warning to enthusiastic persons in high places. After the last war other nations learned that our Executive had overreached his powers. Hitler later said, "After 1919 the word of the President of the United States counts for no more than precisely nothing." He had learned that the United States Congress had to assent. The Congress will have to approve any definite agreements after this war. This amendment seems harmless, except that perhaps it might give other nations a little more reason to believe that the permanent commitments must be ratified by this body.

The master agreement under article 7 is something that makes us rather nervous.

It recites that in these definite agreements there will be free flow of commerce and tariff reductions. It would appear that the United States is already bound by this master agreement. We have not yet ratified that charter. I recall that after the last war when other nations were asked to pay, they answered, "We will furnish you labor." We replied, "No, we have immigration laws. We do not want your labor." They said, "We will send you goods." We replied, "No. We wish to manufacture our own goods. What we want is gold." Those nations had no gold.

The recitation in article 7 seems to be based on the determination to take labor and goods in return for lend-lease. We want no definite agreements made now—no agreements of a permanent nature now. The amendment simply limits the resolution to permanent agreements. We can hardly visualize now what would be a proper final settlement. Other nations are very reticent. Russia may even send us a bill. This is a United Nations war. If we are all to share equitably and afterward determine how much each nation has contributed, Russia might well say, "We lost more in lives and treasure. We put in vastly more than you." Instead of being a creditor we may actually be a debtor to Russia in the final determination.

I want no agreements made by those in power at the moment which will lead other nations to believe them to be of a permanent nature unless the Congress has ratified them. This amendment takes care of that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman distinguish between the master agreement and the lend-lease agreement?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am following the report of the committee. I do not know that I am fully able to distinguish. This amendment refers to the master agreement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The preamble which the gentleman read is the preamble of the master agreement. It does not touch the ordinary lend-lease agreements. Some of them may be final in character.

Mr. GIFFORD. And perhaps do not need to be ratified. I read the gentleman's speech of yesterday, but I fear he did not inform us as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I was about to offer an amendment to subsection 5, section 3, by adding the following:

Any defense article so exported shall be insured against loss in an insurance carrier organized and existing under the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof, or domiciled in the United States; and the loss, if any, shall be payable to the United States Treasury in United States currency.

Let me say first I shall not offer the amendment because I have been dis-

sueded to do so by the chairman of the committee, who feels that the purpose of my amendment may be worked out by regulation rather than by legislation. If that is not done, or cannot be done, then I will offer a bill later upon which the Chairman has promised me a prompt hearing, which will, I hope, accomplish my purpose.

Presently the British Minister of Food and Supply insures all food supplies that are sent from the United States to Great Britain and to other parts of the world under lend-lease, in British insurance companies, payable in British pounds sterling, so that when any loss does occur, although the cost of the premium is charged up in a bookkeeping transaction between the two countries, that loss cannot be paid to the United States, or to the agency that may have the ownership of those foodstuffs, because the money being paid in pounds sterling cannot be remitted to the United States. It seems to me that in view of all the aid that is being given to foreign countries, it is proper that the Administrator of Lend-Lease should see to it that this insurance of lend-lease material is placed with American companies. Up to December 31 of this past year this business amounted to something like \$21,000,000 in premiums alone, and in this year 1943 it is estimated that the premiums will run to approximately \$80,000,000 or more.

That means a big loss of business not only to American insurance companies, but it means a big loss in dividends to the stockholders and eventually in taxes to the United States Treasury. This is no time to divert business from the United States.

It seems strange that other agencies like the Metal Reserves Company, Commodity Credit Corporation, and other governmental agencies should bring their purchases of defense articles into the United States covered by insurance in American companies and as soon as these defense articles arrive in this country and are allocated to foreign countries under lend-lease, the American insurance should be canceled and new insurance placed with British companies, the loss payable in British pounds sterling, so that the money cannot come back to the United States until after the war is over. Even those shipments that are made to Brazil or South American countries under lend-lease are insured in British companies. This does not seem right to me and therefore I hope that either through regulation or legislation, if necessary, this situation will be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, we have been here discussing this bill for 2 days, and on the very first amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] we find him making one statement as to the effect of his amendment and we find the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] standing here and making a diametri-

cally opposite statement as to the effect of this amendment. Then after these two gentlemen have discussed the merits of the amendment we find the distinguished ranking minority member of this committee, making a speech which does not bear upon the merits of the amendment at all but saying that we have got to shush-shush and shoot this through because somebody might be offended unless this bill were passed exactly as written. He is followed by the distinguished majority Member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], who tells us substantially the same thing.

I heard the speeches made yesterday. Man after man on the floor of this House was trying to get information, but nobody on this committee seemed to be able to give the Members of this House authoritative information as to the facts with reference to lend-lease; yet as Members of Congress we must have this bill jammed down our throats without even an opportunity to offer an amendment that meets the wishes of the people of this country.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio who offered this amendment that I would like to ask a question but do not appear to be able to get an answer from the experts now on the floor. As I have understood the legislation, or rather the diplomatic processes of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements, they write those agreements and they are not approved by the Senate. Now, then, as to those agreements: They are not unilateral, they are bilateral agreements and when it comes to the action of a South American country its legislative assembly has to pass upon them. That is as I understood the lease-lend arrangements. The question is simple: The gentleman's amendment proposes that the Congress by concurrent resolution pass not upon the final benefits in these little temporary agreements, but the final benefits that are to be achieved under this lease-lend aid. They say: "Oh, the Congress should not have anything to do with that." Oh, no; this great committee has passed on it, or a majority of them—shush-shush, do not say anything about it, somebody is likely to be annoyed. Rush into this thing blindly and leave it entirely to this committee—leave it to the President. Congress should not know anything about it; no. This amendment refers to the final agreements. Is not that right?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has stated it very accurately.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, one other question; see if we can get it accurately: In the South American countries with whom these temporary agreements have been negotiated, are the agreements subject to ratification or approval of the legislative assembly of the country in question?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The report shows that many final agreements may be in the form of treaties, may be other actions that require action by Congress;

but the report shows that they are saving out one kind of final agreement that should not have such action, and it is that one I am trying to get at.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; that does not answer the question. Before this debate closes I should like to ask someone to answer the simple question: Is the other party to one of these agreements required to have legislative approval?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this bill many unwise statements have been made. The trouble here in Congress seems to be that the Members think out loud. On reflection, some things that have been said would not have been said.

During the critical period of this war, it is absolute nonsense to leave the war and gather around the peace table. It might be a source of news to say that we haven't yet won the war. When—during the past month—action on all fronts has shown the mettle of our own soldiers and those of our allies and that they have the enemy on the run, we start in deliberately to determine what each shall have when the war is over.

This debate on the continuation of lease-lend is nothing but a formal show, because the great overwhelming sentiment here is to extend our aid. As long as we are in this war we shall have to give what we have, and I—for one—would much rather give in money and materials than in the lives of our best manhood. One of our closest friends and allies is China where there are millions of men without fighting equipment. If we can get that aid to China, we can save the lives of a million men from this country. The problem of setting Japan back where she belongs will be comparatively easy if we can give China what she needs in planes and guns. We can, of course, take the other course of saving the money we might give China and undertake a "bushwhacker's" war, which will take years to drive the Japs back where they belong. In the meantime, no one can calculate the lives we shall lose.

This same situation applies to England. The tremendous amount of financial aid we have given England has enabled her to get ready to fight. And the Eighth Army has demonstrated that when it is ready it can fight.

The same applies to Russia. Russia is with us and we are with Russia to drive out and wipe out the power of the Axis. We have given much to Russia and we ought to give much more, and cease jeopardizing the whole program by suppositions as to what Russia wants out of the war, or because we think Stalin has not told the Russian people enough about our help.

What difference does it make whether Stalin has told them enough or whether he has told his people anything. We are at war and the Russians have fought brilliantly and we must give them what help we can in every way we can. We must treat Russia just exactly as we

would want her to treat us regardless of whether Russia follows the Golden Rule or not. We can keep our own consciences clear and that is the most important thing to us.

Much criticism was turned loose because Stalin did not attend the Casablanca conference. Will someone please step up and explain how he could when everyone knew his operating agreement with Japan? Under that agreement with Japan, Russia is getting all the foodstuffs she can obtain on our west coast, and this food is shipped to Russia unmolested by Japan. Anything that is not strictly a war machine is permitted to pass. Suppose Stalin had attended this meeting which, in its course, outlined a plan to clean up Japan. Just what position would he have placed himself in? Stalin did the right thing in terms of existing war in keeping clear out of this meeting, and I think Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill were perfectly satisfied with the situation.

Russia is doing enough in fighting Germany without inviting Japan to take a hand and attack her from the rear.

The world watches this Congress and the things said here are important to the cause of freedom. The world watches the statements made by our leaders out of Congress, and, therefore, all should weigh carefully what they say before they say it rather than do the weighing afterward.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, I think we shall all agree that much as we have our heart and soul in winning this war and giving it everything we have, we must also have equally in our hearts the determination to preserve at all times intact the Constitution of the United States. It is with this in mind that I believe we should compliment the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who under pressure, who under exhortation to say nothing and to accept everything—I want to compliment them that they have tried to preserve the constitutional processes in what they did in the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee. The State Department sent to that committee Mr. Acheson and in his testimony, which is found on page 81 of the hearings, he emphasizes the fact that this lend-lease has a twofold aspect. He stated:

Our foreign policy has two basic objectives—to help in winning the war and prepare for an enduring peace.

I have heard no objection to the parts of the bill that are for the winning of the war, but I believe that it is shortsighted for anyone to come here and try to challenge us and say that we have no right as the great legislative branch of this Government, either House or Senate, to exercise the prerogatives which were given to us by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as the Members consider the amendment now pending before the House, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYSE], I ask them to consider it in the constructive aspect in which it is offered. He is not

questioning the wisdom of helping the war effort, he is not meticulously trying to question any agreements that may have been made up to this time, but when we have already authorized over \$60,000,000,000 for lend-lease he simply has in effect made the statement that in the future commitments and in the final shaping of the binding force of all of this upon the people of the United States who live here and their children to follow, let us consult the legislative branch of the Government, let us have a chance to shape the final form of these things. And in that regard I want to call to your attention that on several pages of the RECORD the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] asked Mr. Acheson, particularly on page 101 of the hearings, this question, and Mr. Acheson assured him this would have to go before the Congress. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on page 120 of the hearings had the same affirmation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] on page 125 of the hearings had the same assurances. In each and every case the State Department said there would have to be a consultation with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Churchill has said, and I admire him as a great Englishman for having said it:

I am not here as the first King's Prime Minister to liquidate the British Empire.

I do not believe there is a single Member of this House, who has sworn to protect the Constitution, here to liquidate the Constitution of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment goes to the very heart of the question as to whether this Congress is sincere and courageous in its heralded desire to take unto itself its rightful position as a coordinate branch of government. That fundamentally is the question which we face today, the question of whether we are going to assert ourselves as a legislative branch of the Government and write into this law prerogatives which are rightfully ours, or whether we are going to nullify our brave declarations made to the folks back home about not being rubber stamps, and about being here to represent the people, by turning down the first opportunity presented to us today to reserve to the Congress rights which actually belong to it.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the strange philosophy enunciated by the ranking majority and minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when they tell us that we should not even take time to consider any amendment of any kind to this legislation. They tell you that the thing to do is to pass this legislation as it is now written and that you should not amend it when you can, but, after you do pass it, come back here and seek to amend it when you cannot get to it any more. Certainly, if we are going to have a legislative branch of government we should be energetic enough and devoted enough to consider

amendments to all legislation at the time such legislation is before us and to accept or reject them on the basis of merit and not as a collective set of rubber stamps disapprove in the dark amendments which we have not even heard read.

I have no amendment to offer, but I hope that those who do have them will stand upon their congressional feet and offer them and not be beguiled by the siren call of the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Texas that you should not even consider amending this legislation. We are not enacting the Bible into law here today. We are not asked to pass upon Holy Writ. If anyone has a constructive idea for the improvement of lend-lease he has a right to be heard. This House then has the right, the power, and the good judgment to approve or disapprove of such amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill because I think lend-lease is necessary to our war effort. I also believe that it can be improved by the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYSE], because that amendment writes into law what we have been told unofficially by representatives of the State Department, who say that the Congress should and will be included in the final settlement. We have their word for that at page 120 of the hearings and at other places. This amendment writes that prediction into the law. This amendment makes it positive. This amendment says that final settlements made under article VII with its vast powers of final determination must be concurred in by joint resolution of the Congress.

Let me say to you Members of Congress who may feel that you should vote against this amendment for partisan reasons, that if you disapprove of it, at no later time can you go back to your constituents and complain then, if in the final settlement, labor or agriculture or business in your districts has been ignored or its rights have been seriously handicapped, because you will have approved in advance by your defeat of this amendment anything which can be put into article VII in terms of final settlement and made to appear valid without the consent and approval of Congress.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does not the gentleman feel, in the absence of the amendment now under consideration, that it may be well argued in the future that Congress has already delegated to the Chief Executive full power to conclude these final arrangements by executive agreement and that the Congress is therefore precluded from any part in those agreements?

Mr. MUNDT. I definitely feel that danger does exist and for that reason when lend-lease was originally before the House I supported an amendment of this same type to reserve to Congress certain powers with regard to final settlements. That amendment was then defeated. Now is the time when we should no longer fail to assert ourselves

as a coordinate branch of this Government. Now is the time to take positive constructive action to assure our citizens that their Congress will have its authority respected when the final settlements and benefits of lend-lease are being determined.

I shall support H. R. 1501 whether or not this amendment is approved because we are at war and it has now become a part of our whole war program. However, if this amendment is approved, I am sure this Congress and the country will feel a gratifying reassurance that the executive and legislative branches of Government will work together instead of at divergent purposes when the terms of final settlement are written. If this amendment in any way crippled the operations of lend-lease or circumscribed its effectiveness, I would oppose it just as I opposed numerous amendments when offered in our committee sessions, but since this amendment serves to increase rather than decrease the effectiveness and value of lend-lease I am happy to support it, and I hope it will receive a favorable vote here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the lend-lease policy as adopted is supported by practically every Member of the House as a war measure at this time. I would oppose any amendment which I thought would restrict the operation or the efficiency of lend-lease as a weapon in winning the war.

I recall that some months back an amendment was offered to an appropriation bill which would deny the use of lend-lease funds for lend-leasing articles to Russia. I recall opposing that amendment because I thought lend-lease was the settled policy of the country and that having put our hand to the plow we could not withdraw. The only way out of the war is to go through to victory. I am glad that I did. Russia has used well the weapons we have sent to her.

If I thought the amendment now under consideration would in any way jeopardize the efficient use of lend-lease as a weapon in winning the war I would be opposed to it. My understanding is, however, that the application of this amendment is restricted to the consideration of the final settlement of lend-lease operations. If that be the case, it will mean necessarily that all lend-lease operations with any particular country will have been concluded up to the matter of a final settlement. The war will have been won, or at least all the lend-leasing will have been completed. Perhaps the question might better have been put to us in the form of proposing that the final settlements be submitted to Congress for consideration by a concurrent resolution, without any reference to the date of June 30. The issue before us might be clearer.

I am not concerned, in this argument, with whether the dollar sign is in our favor or against us. When you are on a football team you do not stop to figure

out whether you are playing harder or putting in more effort than some other member of the team. Not if you play to win. You give your best. You put in everything you can.

That is our situation today. We are members of a team. And we must play to win. We must win. There is no other course for a nation at war. Whatever may have been the wisdom of keeping books on a dollar-and-cents basis before we entered the war ourselves, there is no object in worrying about cash balances today. The only yardstick today is whether the net result of a proposed action is a shove toward victory.

So, in speaking on this amendment, I am not thinking about balances when this is over. I am only thinking of victory. And victory includes our ability to maintain our way of life afterward. On that point, the amendment merits consideration. Does it offer a valuable aid in maintaining the American way of life in the days that follow the war? It seems to me that it does; and that it does not interfere in the slightest with the prosecution of the war. Lend-lease will go on; the amendment comes into play only after lend-leasing days are over and final settlements are being made.

Now, then, article 7 of the master agreements provides that the final lend-lease settlement shall include, among other things, provisions directed to the reduction of tariffs. I am not a high-tariff man. In 1928 I spoke against excessive tariffs. I placed many of our troubles on our failure to recognize that we had become a creditor nation. I do believe, however, that a proper tariff has an important part to play in the development of infant industries and in the protection of our standard of living, in social security if you please. And if I were a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would be asking myself this afternoon whether we meant that the jurisdiction and the responsibilities of my committee were being jeopardized if this amendment is rejected.

I would ask myself, Why should I agree to surrender consideration of the final settlement of lend-lease agreements when other countries will submit to their legislative assemblies the ratification of final settlement?

The committee report says—

A fourth direct benefit is the program of economic action to which article VII of the agreements look toward.

I do not want to draw any red herrings across the trail this afternoon, but I can think of several proposals for economic policy in speeches that have been made before the country in the past few months that I would not want to see written into lend-lease agreements without an opportunity being afforded the Congress to consider their effect upon the country. So I would feel that I were derelict in my duty today if I failed to support the suggestion of the amendment that Congress reserve the right to consider the economic programs put forward in the final settlements. That is the issue as I see it, purely and simply.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. While I have a great deal of sympathy with the thought behind this amendment, I believe that inasmuch as the administration is constantly entering into agreements with various countries under the authority of the Lend-Lease Act, it will be impossible to determine whether or not an agreement is the final agreement until the time of the final settlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER].

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to every speech made on the lend-lease discussion, including the system, or lack of system, of keeping accounts on the same. After so listening I conclude: We are furnishing war aid to our associates, and they are furnishing war aid to us, without regard to the amount or cost contributed by each and with no expectation of an accounting hereafter. We are without information as to the amount of reverse aid received, and, from our associate's bookkeeping, we cannot find out, and they have not told.

It is estimated here we have appropriated for lend-lease \$63,000,000,000 and the United Kingdom has contributed \$1,000,000,000 reverse aid to recent date. China has received about 2 percent; Russia, 3 percent; the British Empire, the balance. A great part of this aid is food, which is sold by the British, and the proceeds go into their treasury and is used by them in their current account.

To date China has fought the war 5 years, and no practical way has been advanced here to materially increase the lend-lease aid to her. We have sold Japan much more. Russia has done most of the fighting and won all the victories to date.

At home we are short of food; rationed on most of it. Most of our farm boys are employed in war industries or are in the Army. The same is true of the small-town boys. There is no substantial reserve upon which to draw for farm labor to increase food production. The old men on the farms and school children cannot do it. Our production without a doubt will fall below 1942. A 1936 drought would be disastrous. Our soldiers must be fed first. Our gravest danger is our war to the west, and Secretary Knox says the "Pacific Lake" is ours. These fighters here must be fed at all hazards. Our people at home must be fed as a prerequisite to production for the above purposes. My conclusion is, lend-lease to the east is given preference over our needs in the Pacific and at home.

In addition there has been charged on this floor lend-lease is forming now the basis for a world-wide distribution of our food, policing the world, and disarming all those nations who do not join us in our program. Indeed, some

Members have gloated over the Utopian conditions it is to produce. I cannot subscribe. My American education and training puts my own country, people, and flag first. I have read Washington's Farewell Address once a year since I quit school 50 years ago. It, with the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Monroe Doctrine are the four pillars of our Government. Destroy them, and you have destroyed the Government. To me their declarations constitute the American Bible. National policy that squares with them is Americanism. Otherwise not. It is the faith of our fathers. We cannot trust any nation on earth. All of them would cut our throat for their self-interest. They would blow out our light of freedom. When Columbus discovered the New World in 1492 the first thing he saw was a light. He knew there was land. It was the light of freedom in this land. It has burned here ever since. We must not blow it out. It is time for this country to save itself. These are my opinions, my judgment, and my conscience, before God.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, it is very surprising to note the unanimous committee report on this measure. No one in this historic Chamber is in opposition to any measure designed to promote victory in our great cause. Nevertheless there is a natural and almost invariable difference of opinion as to means, methods, and instruments by which this all-wise goal can most quickly be reached.

Controversy and difference of opinion is implicit in representative government as is almost constantly demonstrated in this very body. These controversies and differences have characterized practically every measure considered by this Congress. Not so long ago, we spent some considerable time debating the question of whether a single colored man was to be permitted to hold a job in the Government service. Virtually every measure presented here has been accompanied with some show of dissension or disagreement and since that is the modus operandi of healthy democratic government, we have come to expect it as a natural concomitant of the legislative process.

So it seems to me all the more remarkable to note no expression of difference of opinion with regard to a measure which undertakes, as this one does, to spend literally fabulous sums of the American people's money to arm, equip, feed, and clothe a very large part of the world—a burden that falls and will continue to fall with increasing weight as the years go along upon the taxpayers of America, large and small.

I have no fundamental objection to rendering every reasonable and feasible assistance to the nations associated with us in the prosecution of this war. In my humble view, the American people desire and intend that in waging this colossal struggle—a struggle that extends to dis-

tant and well-nigh all-embracing sections of the world—our Nation shall extend to our allies every aid and assistance that we reasonably can, consistently with our own safety, the demands of our own armed forces and the needs of our own civilian population.

Having this basic principle in mind, I have been amazed and shocked at the many stories and rumors, some unsubstantiated, others authentic, concerning the character of lend-lease assistance to foreign nations. There is no doubt that substantial shipments of farm machinery, butter, meat, sugar, coffee, canned goods, and other necessities of life have been shipped to Russia, England, and many other places. I have heard and understood that our warehouses have been virtually denuded and stripped of these vital commodities for the benefit of our allies and even certain neutral countries. I have heard and understood that butter, a staple food of our people, in which there is the very greatest shortage here, was being sent to Russia where it is asserted the people have had no widespread use of this essential food product in the past, and that good American shoes had been sent to North Africa where most of the natives, never having worn shoes, are reported to utilize them by slinging them around their necks and using them for pockets. There are also reports that we have sent rayon panties and pajamas to the relatively uncivilized peoples of North Africa, and various high-grade brands of whiskey to several countries.

Realizing that some of these persistent reports might have emanated from enemy propaganda sources, or that they were grossly exaggerated, or even downright untrue, but desiring to obtain an explanation, I undertook to write to appropriate officials to make certain inquiries as to the character and extent of the operations of that agency.

The answers I received were in no sense illuminating, but, to the contrary, reticent and secretive. If full and detailed disclosure were made to the public and the Congress, perhaps some of the skepticism and suspicion concerning the policies of Lend-Lease could have been dispelled.

For my part, I am most skeptical of and seriously question the wisdom of several major policies pursued by those responsible for administering the enormous lend-lease program.

Firstly, I am opposed to donating basic necessities of life essential to the maintenance of the health and strength of our own people to the civilian populations of other nations while our own people are suffering serious shortages or threatened with critical need and privation.

Secondly, I am vigorously opposed to the so-called policy of economic inflation which seeks to buy off the good will and favor of assorted native populations and mold political opinion through the use of huge quantities of American food and commodities not taken from our own surpluses but from our so-called ever-normal granary. As a result of this policy, are we not rapidly reaching

that point where the ever-normal granary can better be described as the empty pantry?

Thirdly, the Lend-Lease Administration and the Foreign Affairs Committee have failed to convince me that the so-called lend-lease in reverse embraces much more than fractional repayments when considered in relation to the billions of dollars already spent and contemplated for the future by the United States. It is, of course, reassuring to know that some of the countries upon whom we have lavished largesse unprecedented in history of ships, planes, weapons of war, equipment of every type and description, food, clothing, and a range of commodities and luxuries as wide as our modern economy itself, should have some appreciation of our beneficence and move to some extent within their own means to reciprocate by tenders in kind. But let no one be under the impression that the sum total of these reciprocal bounties ever will, or indeed ever can, measure up in value and quantity to our own gigantic lend-lease conveyances. That the people of one of the chief beneficiary nations should be entirely uninformed up to recent date of this invaluable assistance rendered by us is unquestionably ground for profound speculation by our elder statesmen as to the potentialities, the possibilities, and the probabilities of the future policy of that nation, about which for the sake of propriety I shall not further enlarge upon here but commit to the most earnest and immediate consideration of the executive department of the Government.

In the light of the foregoing views, I should very much have welcomed the opportunity to place some decisive legislative checks upon the future operations of lend-lease, in particular, the withdrawals of basic foods, commodities, and machinery required for the soundness of our domestic economy and the health and vitality of our own people.

In view of the unanimous approval of the committee and the existence of a special rule, as well as the bipartisan support accorded the bill, I am conscious of the futility of extensive amendment of policy. Moreover, I think this is a time, surrounded as we are by the threatening clouds of destruction, when individual concessions must be made in the interest of a harmonized and unified national spirit.

Accordingly, with no inconsiderable reluctance, I propose to vote for this measure. But in so doing, I wish to record my disagreement with and protest of several principle policies of lend-lease which I deem require, and hope will receive, prompt alteration and revision.

Let us continue to help our allies, but in the process let us not dissipate the strength of our own people and weaken the structure of our own economy. Remember—this war may yet have a long way to go. It may lead us into the valley of death, into the shadows of sacrifice and sorrow such as no great nation before was ever able to endure. It may bring changes in the tides of battle and realignments in loyalties and asso-

ciations scarcely imaginable at this time. When these vicissitudes come—and pray God they will not—we will need a stronger, a more vital, a more dynamic, a more resolute America than ever.

Mindful to the fullest of our proper obligations to humanity, let us stop snatching food from the mouths of our own people in order to pursue fugitive social reform or impossible economic infiltration among the assorted nations of all the earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is clearly an anxiety on the part of the membership to get rid of this proposed amendment and to vote on the real issue.

I do not propose to take any more time than is involved in my saying that I think the discussion has already been too long prolonged to no purpose justified by the situation.

I voted for the original lend-lease bill.

This is an act the intent and purpose of which is to extend the life and the terms of the original act. I propose to vote to extend the original act. That is the question before the House to be voted up or down.

I do not propose to discuss the merits or demerits of any proposed amendments. They do not concern me or the bill at this time.

They are conditions subsequent to and not a part of the original act or the contract which is now before us for our ratification or renewal, as originally written.

I shall vote against all amendments. I shall vote for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 96, noes 115.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VORYS of Ohio and Mr. BLOOM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, pursuant to House Resolution 142, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 407, nays 6, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—407

Abernethy	Dewey	Hobbs
Allen, Ill.	Dickstein	Hoch
Allen, La.	Dies	Hoeven
Andersen,	Dilweg	Holifield
H. Carl	Dirksen	Holmes, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Disney	Holmes, Wash.
Anderson,	Ditter	Hope
N. Mex.	Domengaueux	Horan
Andresen,	Dondero	Howell
August H.	Doughton	Hull
Andrews	Douglas	Izac
Angell	Drewry	Jackson
Arends	Durham	Jarman
Arnold	Dworshak	Jeffrey
Auchincloss	Eaton	Jenkins
Baldwin, Md.	Eberharter	Jennings
Baldwin, N. Y.	Elliott	Jensen
Barrett	Ellis	Johnson,
Barry	Ellison, Md.	Anton J.
Bates, Ky.	Ellsworth	Johnson,
Bates, Mass.	Elston, Ohio	Calvin D.
Beall	Engel	Johnson, Ind.
Beckworth	Englebright	Johnson,
Bell	Fay	J. Leroy
Bender	Feighan	Johnson,
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Luther A.
Bennett, Mo.	Fenton	Johnson,
Bishop	Fernandez	Lyndon B.
Blackney	Fish	Johnson, Okla.
Bland	Fisher	Johnson, Ward
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	Jonkman
Bolton	Flannagan	Judd
Bonner	Fogarty	Kean
Boren	Folger	Kearney
Boykin	Forand	Kee
Bradley, Mich.	Ford	Keefe
Bradley, Pa.	Fulbright	Kefauver
Brooks	Fulmer	Kelley
Brown, Ga.	Furlong	Kennedy
Brown, Ohio	Gale	Keogh
Bryson	Gallagher	Kerr
Buckley	Gamble	Kilburn
Buffett	Gathings	Kilday
Bulwinkle	Gavagan	King
Burch, Va.	Gavin	Kinzer
Burchill, N. Y.	Gearhart	Kirwan
Burdick	Gerlach	Kleberg
Burgin	Gifford	Klein
Busbey	Gilchrist	Knutson
Butler	Gillette	Kunkel
Byrne	Gillie	LaFollette
Camp	Goodwin	Lambertson
Canfield	Gordon	Landis
Cannon, Fla.	Gore	Lane
Cannon, Mo.	Gorski	Lanham
Capozzoli	Gossett	Larcade
Carlson, Kans.	Graham	Lea
Carson, Ohio	Granger	LeCompte
Carter	Grant, Ala.	LeFevre
Case	Grant, Ind.	Lemke
Celler	Green	Lesinski
Chapman	Gregory	Lewis, Ohio
Chenoweth	Griffiths	Luce
Chipperfield	Gross	Ludlow
Church	Guyer	Lynch
Clark	Gwynne	McCord
Clason	Hagen	McCormack
Clevenger	Hale	McCowan
Coffee	Hall	McGehee
Cole, Mo.	Edwin Arthur	McGranery
Cole, N. Y.	Hall,	McKenzie
Colmer	Leonard W.	McLean
Compton	Halleck	McMillan
Cooley	Hancock	McMurray
Cooper	Hare	McWilliams
Costello	Harless, Ariz.	Maas
Courtney	Harness, Ind.	Madden
Cox	Harris, Ark.	Magnuson
Cravens	Harris, Va.	Mahon
Creal	Hart	Maloney
Crosser	Hartley	Manasco
Cullen	Hays	Mansfield,
Cunningham	Hébert	Mont.
Curley	Heffernan	Mansfield, Tex.
Curtis	Heidinger	Marcantonio
D'Alessandro	Hendricks	Martin, Iowa
Dawson	Herter	Martin, Mass.
Day	Hess	Mason
Delaney	Hill	May

Merritt	Ramspeck	Stewart
Morrow	Randolph	Stockman
Michener	Rankin	Sullivan
Miller, Conn.	Reed, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Miller, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.	Summers, Tex.
Miller, Pa.	Rees, Kans.	Sundstrom
Mills	Richards	Taber
Monkiewicz	Rivers	Talbot
Monroney	Rizley	Talle
Morrison, La.	Robertson	Tarver
Morrison, N. C.	Robinson, Utah	Taylor
Mott	Robson, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Mruk	Rockwell	Thomas, Tex.
Mundt	Rodgers, Pa.	Thomason
Murdoch	Rogers, Calif.	Tibbott
Murphy	Rogers, Mass.	Tolan
Murray, Tenn.	Rohrbough	Towe
Murray, Wis.	Rolph	Treadway
Myers	Rowan	Troutman
Newsome	Rowe	Van Zandt
Nichols	Russell	Vincent, Ky.
Norman	Sabath	Vinson, Ga.
Norrell	Sadowski	Voorhis, Calif.
Norton	Sasser	Vorys, Ohio
O'Brien, Ill.	Satterfield	Vursell
O'Brien, Mich.	Sauthoff	Wadsworth
O'Brien, N. Y.	Scanlon	Walter
O'Hara	Schiffner	Ward
O'Konski	Schwabe	Wasielewski
O'Leary	Scott	Weaver
O'Neal	Shafer	Weichel, Ohio
Outland	Sheppard	Weiss
Pace	Sheridan	Welch
Patman	Short	Wene
Patton	Sikes	West
Peterson, Fla.	Simpson, Ill.	Wheat
Peterson, Ga.	Simpson, Pa.	Whittington
Pfeiffer	Smith, Maine	Wickersham
Philbin	Smith, Va.	Wigglesworth
Phillips	Smith, Wis.	Willey
Pittenger	Snyder	Wilson
Ploeser	Somers, N. Y.	Winstead
Plumley	Sparkman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Poage	Spence	Wolverton, N. J.
Poulson	Springer	Woodrum, Va.
Powers	Stanley	Worley
Pracht	Starnes, Ala.	Wright
Price	Steagall	Zimmerman
Priest	Stearns, N. H.	
Rabaut	Stefan	
Ramey	Stevenson	

NAYS—6

Brehm	Hoffman	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Jones	Woodruff, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Elmer

NOT VOTING—20

Barden	Lewis, Colo.	Slaughter
Cochran	McGregor	Smith, W. Va.
Culkin	Miller, Nebr.	Wheelchel, Ga.
Davis	O'Connor	White
Dingell	O'Toole	Whitten
Gibson	Reece, Tenn.	Winter
Hinshaw	Schuetz	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Barden of North Carolina, with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Wheelchel with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I was detained at one of the departments and did not get back here in time to vote on the lend-lease bill. Had I been here I would have voted for the bill because I favor it.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NATIONAL RESOURCES BOARD
(H. DOC. NO. 128)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed, together with the illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

To assist the Congress in the development and consideration of appropriate legislation to achieve normal employment, to give assurance for all our people against common economic hazards, and to provide for the development of our national resources, I am transmitting herewith two reports of the National Resources Planning Board.

The first, "National Resources Development—Report for 1943" presents the results to date of the Board's work on post-war plans and a record of wartime planning activities. The Board proposes measures to meet the problems of the transition period from war to peace and for the longer-range development of an expanding economy. It is appropriate that each year the immediate programs contained in the Budget of the United States should be considered by the Congress in the light of much longer range plans and programs. To facilitate such use of this report, I recommend that the report be printed, in accordance with past custom.

We can all agree on our objectives and in our common determination that work, fair pay, and social security after the war is won must be firmly established for the people of the United States of America.

Men in the armed forces and all those engaged in the war effort rightly expect us to be considering their future welfare.

We fight today for security for our Nation and at the same time we can endeavor to give our citizens and their families security against attacks from without, and against fear of economic distress in old age, in poverty, sickness, involuntary unemployment, and accidental injuries. We need to look forward to the accomplishment of these objectives—world peace, democratic society, and a dynamic economy.

The second report transmitted herewith, on "Security, Work, and Relief Policies," has been developed over the last 3 years by the National Resources Planning Board, at my request, with the cooperation of the Federal agencies concerned and with the help of citizens with special knowledge and competence in this field. It reviews the accomplishments and experience of the last 10 years, pointing out some of the weaknesses of our security system, and suggesting ways of improving and strengthening the whole program.

Because of their basic importance to our national welfare during the war and after the war, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will give these matters full consideration during this session. We must not return to the inequities, insecurity, and fears of the past, but ought to move forward toward the promise of

the future. When the Congress has agreed on procedures for the consideration of these problems, the executive agencies responsible for the administration of programs in these fields are prepared to provide the Congress with all assistance within their power in devising appropriate ways and means to accomplish these high purposes.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 10, 1943.

DEFERMENT (H. DOC. NO. 127)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 10, 1943.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On December 15, 1942, I appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Paul Bellamy (chairman), Mr. Ordway Tead, and Mr. Eric Johnston for the purpose of making an independent study and recommendations to me on the question of deferments of Federal employees from induction in the military service.

This committee, after applying itself industriously to its task for more than 2 months, has now presented its report. For the information of the House, I am transmitting herewith a copy of this report and of the Executive order which I have signed giving effect to the committee's recommendations.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Russian War Relief, and also a statement by the attaché of the Czechoslovakia Legation. The Public Printer tells me that this will cost \$90, and I ask unanimous consent that it be extended in the RECORD nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of production of merchant ships.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COST OF FARM LABOR

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following privileged report (H. Res. 157, Rept. No. 239) for printing, under the rule, which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1408) to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SOVIET WOMEN'S ANTI-FASCIST
COMMITTEE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about Russia and aid to Russia in the last 2 days. Under leave of the House, I shall now read into the RECORD a message that was sent to the Freedom Loving Women of the World by the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee, saying that the British and American aid "are keenly felt in our country."

The message was in celebration of Soviet Women's Day. The bulletin, published by the Soviet information bulletin, was dated March 6, and says, in part:

Dear sisters of England and America, we know that you are doing your utmost for victory over our common enemy, Hitlerism. Your support and material aid are keenly felt in our country and are a source of inspiration to us in our grim struggle. But the enemy is not yet smashed. To hasten the final defeat of our enemy the united efforts of all freedom-loving nations must be intensified.

Further, Mr. Speaker, on the Soviet Women's Day, March 8, I sent a message to Russia which was relayed, praising them for their great heroism and the inspiring part they have played and are playing in winning this war. I know the people of the United States are extremely glad of their appreciation of what we have been doing and are doing to aid our allies. I have said on the floor and in the Foreign Affairs Committee repeatedly that I believe there should be a board set up within lend-lease, consisting of the British, the United States, and the Russians. Russia is not in any quarrel with Japan. There are obvious reasons why we must have a board without China included in that particular group. There are also good reasons why a board should be set up consisting of the United States, Great Britain, and China. It

would make for a very much better understanding and a very much clearer realization in Russia, and in China, of what is being done. They also would feel then that they were having a more complete hearing on lend-lease, and more complete cooperation. I should like to have had an amendment put into lend-lease to this effect, but I realize it seems impossible to secure amendments to lend-lease today. I shall try to secure separate legislation along this line if Executive action be not taken. This can be done by Executive order of the President. I have urged this procedure upon Mr. Stettinius and others who handle the operation of lend-lease. I hope Members of Congress will make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Farmers Bureau of my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, and also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two short articles from boyhood friends of mine, very remarkable articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes today after the conclusion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY WAR POWERS TO GOVERNOR OF VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Vermont, now in session, has enacted, and the Governor of the State has signed, H. 76, which is now the law of Vermont, entitled "An act relating to the defense of the State, granting emergency war powers to the Governor and the political subdivisions of the State, and otherwise prescribing the incidents thereof," and is as follows:

H. 76

An act relating to the defense of the State, granting emergency war powers to the Governor and the political subdivisions of the State, and otherwise prescribing the incidents thereof

It is hereby enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont:

SECTION 1. Short title: This act may be cited as the "State Emergency War Powers Act of 1943."

SEC. 2. Findings; purposes; policy: It is hereby found and declared that it is necessary, because of the war in which the United States of America is engaged, to grant to the Governor and the political subdivisions of the State the emergency war powers and the incidents thereof enumerated herein. It is further declared to be the purpose of this act and the policy of the State thereby to assist the President of the United States of America, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, in the successful prosecution of the war; to cooperate with the Federal Government and other States in matters relating to the war effort; to meet the extraordinary conditions and problems resulting in this State from the war by establishing such organizations and taking such steps as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) A war council is hereby created to consist of five members, as follows: The Governor, the adjutant general, two members from the house of representatives, and one from the senate, who shall counsel and advise with the Governor concerning the exercise by him of any power given him by this act.

(b) The two members from the house shall be elected by that body, and the member from the senate by that body, after nomination from the floor and on a majority vote. Such election shall be held within 10 days after this act becomes effective. A vacancy on the war council in the membership from the house or senate shall immediately be filled by election in the respective bodies if they are in session, but if not by a majority vote of said council.

(c) The war council shall be subject to the call of the governor at all times and shall serve without compensation. The members shall be reimbursed, however, for their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(d) The governor shall, in exercising any power given him by this act, do so only with the approval of a majority of the war council.

SEC. 4. General emergency war powers of the governor: The governor is authorized and empowered:

(a) Cooperation with the President and others.—To cooperate with the President of the United States of America, the Army, the Navy, and all military forces under his command, with other Federal departments, agencies, and independent establishments, and with the officers and agencies of other states in matters pertaining to the war and the common defense of the State and Nation and the incidents thereof; and in connection therewith, to take any measures not inconsistent with the constitution of the State which he may deem proper to carry into effect any request of the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Federal Director of Civilian Defense;

(b) Use of property, services, and resources.—To use and employ within the State, from time to time, and as he may deem expedient, any of the property, services, and resources of the State, for the purposes set forth in this act;

(c) Compliance.—To employ such measures and give such directions to State and local law-enforcement officers and agencies as may be reasonable and necessary for the purpose of securing compliance with the provisions of this act and with the orders, rules and regulations made pursuant thereto;

(d) Organization.—(1) To utilize the services and facilities of existing officers, offices, departments, commissions, boards, bureaus, institutions, and other agencies of the State and of the political subdivisions thereof; and all such officers and agencies shall cooperate with and extend their services and facilities to the Governor as he may request;

(2) To establish agencies and offices and to appoint executive, technical, clerical, and other personnel, to carry out the provisions of this act.

(e) Extent of general powers.—The general powers provided for in this section shall not be limited by any specific powers granted to the Governor by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. The Vermont Council of Safety.—The Governor shall, under the provisions of this act, establish and appoint a State council of defense to be known as the Vermont Council of Safety, consisting of seven members, who shall serve during the pleasure of the Governor.

Said council, when so directed by the Governor, shall prepare, put into effect, and supervise the operation of plans for civilian defense throughout the State, create and dissolve local councils of defense, and define their powers and duties; act as the State agency for cooperation with the Federal Government in all civilian defense matters; and direct the organization of and supervise and coordinate the civilian defense activities within the State.

The Governor shall be chairman of the council, and he may designate one of the members thereof to serve as executive vice chairman.

The Governor is authorized to fill vacancies in the membership of the council as the same may occur.

SEC. 6. Black-outs and other precautionary measures against air raids and other forms of attack: The Governor is authorized and empowered:

(a) Precautionary measures.—To carry out throughout the State or in any area thereof, precautionary measures against air raids and other forms of attack, including practice black-outs, black-outs, radio silences, and such other measures as will suppress any activity which may assist an enemy; and such other precautionary measures as will prevent or minimize the loss of life or injury to persons and property which might result from such attacks: *Provided*, That no such action shall be inconsistent with any order, rule, regulation, or action of the armed forces of the United States, or their duly designated agency, or of the Federal Director of Civilian Defense. Black-outs and radio silences shall be carried out only in such areas, at such times, and for such periods, as shall be designated by air-raid warnings or orders with respect thereto issued by the United States Army, or its duly designated agency, and only under such conditions and in such manner as shall be consistent with any such warning or order; and practice black-outs shall be held only when and as authorized by the United States Army or its duly designated agency.

(b) Cooperation with other States.—Subject to such limitations, to act in concert with the authorities of other States to effect such synchronization and uniformity of black-outs and other precautionary measures as may be necessary to carry out the intent and purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. Traffic control: (a) The Governor may formulate and execute plans and regulations for the control of traffic in order to provide for the rapid and safe movement over public highways and streets of troops, vehicles of a military nature, materials for national defense and war or for use in any war industry, and may coordinate the activities of the departments or agencies of the State and of the political subdivisions thereof concerned directly or indirectly with public highways and streets, in a manner which will best effectuate such plans.

(b) The Governor may prescribe the maximum rates of speed at which any motor vehicle may be operated on any road, highway, or street in the State; prescribe the sizes and weights of such motor vehicles; suspend the application of any statute or regulation levying or assessing any license or other fee, or requiring the issuance of any temporary or other permit or license, insofar as such statute or regulation relates to the entry into or the privilege of operation in this State of any motor vehicle, including busses and house trailers, registered in any other

State and with respect to which a valid and unexpired license has been issued by the other State.

SEC. 8. Lease or loan of State property; transfer of State personnel: Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of law, general, special, or local—

(a) Action by Governor.—Whenever he deems it to be in the public interest, the Governor may:

(1) Authorize any department or agency of the State to lease or lend, on such terms and conditions and for such period as he may deem necessary to promote the public welfare and protect the interest of the State, any real or personal property of the State government or authorize the temporary transfer or employment of personnel of the State government to or by the Army, Navy, or any other branch of the armed forces of the United States of America;

(2) Enter into a contract on behalf of the State for the lease or loan, on such terms and conditions and for such period as he may deem necessary to promote the public welfare and protect the interests of the State, of any real or personal property of the State government, or the temporary transfer or employment of personnel thereof to any political subdivision of the State. The Chief Executive of such political subdivision is hereby authorized for and in the name thereof to enter into said contract with the Governor for the leasing or lending of such property or personnel.

SEC. 9. Emergency health and sanitation areas: (a) Designation of areas.—Upon the recommendation of the State board of health, the Governor may designate as a special emergency health and sanitation area, any area or areas within the State which have been seriously damaged by air raids or other catastrophe, or in which, in the opinion of the Governor the existence of any military or naval establishment of the United States, or of any industrial establishment constructed or enlarged for purposes of national defense, has caused an increase in the population of such area to such an extent as to produce unusual problems of health and sanitation.

(b) Rules and regulations by local boards of health.—Whenever a special emergency health and sanitation area is established, it shall be the duty of the local board of health or boards of the territory within such area to make and enforce rules and regulations designed to prevent the introduction or spreading of any contagious or infectious disease and to safeguard the public health within such area.

(c) Rules and regulations by State board of health.—In the event that any local board of health of the territory within such area is unable or fails to make or enforce adequate rules and regulations for the protection of the public health within special emergency health and sanitation areas established within its jurisdiction, as herein provided, the State board of health is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to make and enforce such rules and regulations for the protection of the public health within such area as may be necessary, and for this purpose shall have all of the powers and authority of local boards of health.

(d) Request for protection.—Any local board of health having jurisdiction in the territory within which such special emergency health and sanitation area has been established, or the Chief Executive of any political subdivision therein, may by application in writing, request the State board of health to undertake the protection of such area and in such event the State board of health may make and enforce reasonable rules and regulations respecting health and sanitation in such area, and shall have all the powers and authority of the local boards of health.

(e) Cooperation with Federal and other health agencies.—The State board of health is hereby directed to cooperate with health agencies of this and other States and the Federal health agencies in carrying out the provisions of State and Federal health and sanitation programs in conformity with the purposes of this section.

SEC. 10. Taking of property and compensation therefor:

(a) Appropriation of property.—For the better prosecution of the war, and whenever in his opinion the consequence of an actual or imminent attack makes such action necessary for the protection of the public, or whenever requested by a duly authorized officer of the Army, Navy, or other branch of the armed forces of the United States, the Governor may take possession of the real or personal property of any municipality, person, or corporation.

(b) Use and employment of same.—He may use and employ for such purposes all property so possessed for such times and in such manner as he shall deem best to accomplish such purposes, and he may when in his opinion the public exigency so requires, sell or distribute, gratuitously to or among any or all of the inhabitants of the State any personal property taken under the provisions of this section, and may fix minimum and maximum prices therefor. All moneys derived from the sale of any such property shall be paid to the State treasurer and deposited to the credit of the State.

(c) Compensation therefor.—The owner of any property so taken shall receive just compensation therefor as follows:

(1) In case property is taken for temporary use, the Governor, within 10 days of the taking, shall fix the amount of compensation to be paid therefor; and in case such property shall be returned to the owner in a damaged condition or shall not be returned to the owner, the Governor shall fix forthwith the amount of compensation to be paid for such damage or failure to return. Such compensation shall be paid forthwith when the amount thereof is fixed. Whenever the Governor shall deem it advisable for the State to become the owner of personal property taken under this section, he shall forthwith cause the owner of such property to be notified thereof in writing by registered mail, postage prepaid, and forthwith cause to be filed a copy of such notice with the secretary of state.

(2) Any owner of property of which possession has been taken under the provisions of this act to whom no award has been made or who is dissatisfied with the amount awarded him by the Governor, may file a petition in the county court within the county wherein the property is situated to have the amount to which he is entitled by way of damages or compensation determined, and thereafter either the petitioner or the State shall have the right to have the amount of such damages or compensation fixed after hearing by three disinterested appraisers appointed by said court, and who shall operate under substantive and administrative procedure to be established by the superior judges. If the petitioner is dissatisfied with the award of said appraisers, he may file an appeal therefrom in said court and thereafter have a trial by jury to determine the amount of such damages or compensation in such manner as the court shall provide. The court costs of a proceeding brought under this section by the owner of property shall be paid by the State; and the fees and expenses of any attorney for such owner shall also be paid by the State after allowance by the court wherein the petition is brought in such amount as the court in its discretion shall fix.

SEC. 11. Emergency war powers of political subdivisions: To protect life and property, the chief executive of each political subdivi-

vision of the State is directed to carry out in his jurisdiction such precautionary measures as may be ordered by the Governor.

SEC. 12. Fields of operation: Without limiting the generality of the foregoing provisions, the orders, rules, and regulations authorized by this act, may include provisions respecting uniform air-raid signals, the control of vehicular and pedestrian traffic, evacuation of persons, congregation of persons in public places or buildings, lighting and noises of all kinds; and provisions as to the recruitment, qualifications, training, equipment, powers, rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of persons authorized to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 13. Enforcement: The law enforcement authorities of the State and of the political subdivisions thereof shall enforce the orders, rules, and regulations issued pursuant to this act.

SEC. 14. Mobilization for fire defense: (a) Outside service by paid, volunteer, and auxiliary firemen.—At the request of the chief executive of any city, town, village, or fire district, the head of any fire department of any other political subdivision may, or if so ordered by the Governor, shall assign and make available for duty and use in such city, town, village, or fire district, under the direction and command of such officer as may be designated for the purpose, any part of the fire-fighting forces and equipment under his control: *Provided*, That any equipment made available by loan, or otherwise, to any city, town, village, or fire district in the State, by the United States Government, or any agency thereof, shall at all times be subject to the order of the United States Government, or such agency, in accordance with the terms and conditions upon which such equipment shall have been made available.

(b) Powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities.—Whenever the fire-fighting forces of any city, town, village, or fire district are rendering outside aid pursuant to this section, the officers and members of such fire-fighting forces shall have the same powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as if they were performing their duties in the political subdivision in which they are normally employed.

(c) Loss, damage, or expense.—The city, town, village, or fire district in which any equipment is used pursuant to this section shall be liable for any loss or damage thereto and shall pay any expense incurred in the operation and maintenance thereof. No claim for such loss, damage, or expense shall be allowed unless, within 60 days after the same is sustained or incurred, an itemized notice of such claim, under oath, is served by mail or otherwise upon the clerk of such city, town, village, or fire district where the equipment was used.

(d) Liability for acts or omissions.—Neither the State nor the political subdivision of the State, whose fire-fighting forces are rendering outside aid pursuant to this section, shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith; nor shall any commissioner, chief, or other superior officer of a fire department, acting pursuant to this section, be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of any of his subordinates while such subordinates are rendering outside aid pursuant to this section under the command of an officer other than himself.

(e) Reimbursement for salaries and expenses.—The political subdivision which is aided pursuant to this section shall reimburse the political subdivision furnishing such aid for the compensation paid to employees furnished under this section during the time the rendition of such aid prevents

them from performing their duties in the political subdivision by which they are normally employed and shall defray the actual traveling and maintenance expenses of such employees while they are rendering such aid. The term "employee" as used herein shall mean, and the provisions of this section shall apply with equal effect to, paid, volunteer, and auxiliary firemen.

SEC. 15. Orders, rules, and regulations: (a) By the Governor.—The Governor may make, amend, and rescind such orders, rules, and regulations as he may deem advisable to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Supplementary orders, rules, and regulations by political subdivisions and other agencies.—The political subdivisions of the State and other agencies designated or appointed by the Governor are authorized and empowered to make, amend and rescind such orders, rules, and regulations as may be necessary to supplement the carrying out of the provisions of this act, but not inconsistent with any orders, rules, or regulations promulgated by the Governor or by any State agency exercising a power delegated to it by him.

(c) Effect of orders, rules, and regulations.—All rules and regulations promulgated by the Governor, pursuant to the provisions of this act shall have the full force and effect of law when a copy thereof is filed in the office of the secretary of state, and is published in all newspapers within the State, forthwith. All existing laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations inconsistent with the provisions of this act, or with any order, rule, or regulation issued under the authority of this act, shall be suspended during the period of time and to the extent that such conflict exists.

(d) Not inconsistent with Federal action.—In order to attain uniformity so far as practicable throughout the country in measures taken to aid the prosecution of the war and civilian defense, all action taken under this act and all orders, rules, and regulations made pursuant thereto, where not already specifically provided for herein, shall be taken or made with due consideration to the orders, rules, regulations, actions, recommendations, and requests of Federal authorities relevant thereto and, to the extent permitted by law, shall be consistent with such orders, rules, regulations, actions, recommendations, and requests.

(e) All orders issued by the Governor shall be filed with the secretary of state.

SEC. 16. Penalties: A person who violates any provision of this act or any rule, order, or regulation made pursuant to this act shall be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned not more than 90 days or both.

SEC. 17. Coordination with Federal Bureau of Investigation: Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of, or action by or over, any intelligence or law-enforcement agency of the State or any of its political subdivisions, which would interfere with any program whereby the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice coordinates within the State the handling of intelligence and internal security matters by law-enforcement officers and law-enforcement agencies.

SEC. 18. Coordination with armed forces of the United States: Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, no action shall be taken under this act, and no order, rule, or regulation made pursuant thereto which is inconsistent with any relevant order, rule, or regulation of the armed forces of the United States.

SEC. 19. Severability: If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

SEC. 20. Effective date; termination: This act shall take effect from its passage and shall remain in force until such date as the legislature, by joint resolution, may designate to be the termination thereof, or, if the legislature be not in session, the date so designated by a proclamation of the Governor; and shall terminate February 1, 1945, unless previously terminated as provided herein.

A. S. BLOOMER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.
Approved February 23, 1943.
WM. H. WILLS, Governor.

Mr. Speaker, this act is one of the most thoughtfully prepared, carefully drawn, comprehensive, and workable enactments of its kind that could be conceived or executed. It will serve to make democracy function.

I need say no more except to remark that when the representatives of the old-time independent Republic I have the great honor to represent, set their hands and their seals to such a delegation of power for the duration, I suggest that it soon will be taken as a model by all those inclined to do likewise, to win the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and insert an editorial from a Puerto Rican paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to the Office of War Information from myself and the reply of Mr. Elmer Davis, including a copy of a press release approved by the Office of War Information with respect to lease-lend jobs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GALE was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Telegraph Forum of Bucyrus, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address

the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of all other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

USE OF MAILS FOR SUBVERSIVE PROPAGANDA

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a list of certain publications in the United States, mailed through the Post Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, within the last 10 years there has grown up in this country a system of using the mails for the distribution of certain undesirable publications which in my opinion is not for the best interests of our country. The mailing of these publications as second-class mail is responsible for a loss to the Government of about forty or fifty million dollars a year. A great number of these publications, in my opinion, is distributed solely for the purpose of bringing about racial intolerance and creating distrust among the various racial and religious groups of the American people. The mail is being used constantly for the purpose of disseminating propaganda of fascistically inclined groups. It would seem to me that the Dies committee could do a good job if they were to investigate the people who back such publications. I am going to list at least 20 or more publications which in my opinion should be banned from the mails because they are preaching the very things against which we are fighting now. While our boys are risking their lives to defeat the forces of fascism and reaction abroad, these people—in a very subtle way—are trying to break ground for these dark forces in our own country. The Post Office Department, in permitting this type of propaganda to be distributed through the mails, unwittingly becomes a party to this conspiracy.

It is my hope that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will study this important problem and determine what can be done—without interfering with the rights and privileges of legitimate publications—to put a stop to having the mails used for these subversive propaganda activities. The publications I am referring to are just as bad as fifth columnists.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope the gentleman will also discuss all of the other material that goes out from Government agencies, which is more propaganda than information.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am for any constructive plan that will stop the Post Office from being the distributor of subversive mail, especially in time of war, when our people are upset emotionally. Individuals and groups that are interested in taking advantage of such a situation by spreading intolerance and race hatred should not be allowed to use our

mails for their insidious activities. Under the present law there is no way to stop them. We are helpless. I believe it is section 600 or 601 of the Revised Statutes which provides that unless the title which appears on the face of the envelope is subversive, the matter contained in the envelope may be distributed through the mails. You and I know of people who are sending out certain mail without advertising its contents on the face of the envelopes, as that would defeat their purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested in what the gentleman is saying, and as I understand his remarks, he is referring to two classes of mail that go through the mail. One is that which perhaps would be denominated as pamphlets and magazines and material of that kind, and the other apparently refers to letters which are sealed. I have some knowledge of the work that the Post Office Department is doing and has been doing for over a year in suppressing the first type of material. I am wondering, if the gentleman has knowledge of the fact that there is going through the mail magazines or literature which is of the character he describes, why he does not make his complaint direct to the Post Office Department and compel these people to face a hearing before the Post Office Department and have their permit to use the mails revoked, as the present Postmaster General has done in any number of instances and is doing every day—conducting these hearings.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have introduced a bill that has been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads that deals with that very subject. I have asked for a hearing on it.

A year or two ago I attempted to do the very thing my distinguished colleague is speaking about, but I had a very difficult time to get an answer, because this problem is very complicated. I do know, however, that most of the German Nazi propaganda and Fascist propaganda was being distributed through the mails, and even now—while we are fighting a war—the Post Office is being used to spread unrest and distrust in our country. I submit, in all fairness to the American people and to the Post Office, that there should be some limitation as to what a man can send through the mails by way of propaganda, if such propaganda tends to arouse race prejudice and disunity.

I have here a list of about 25 magazines, newspapers, and so forth. There may be many more; I would not doubt it. I say to my distinguished colleagues, if they had examined these publications, I believe they would agree that they ought to be removed from the mails. There ought to be some law on the statute books to punish people who are responsible for the publishing and distribution of material to arouse one group of Americans against some of their fellow Americans. They ought not to be permitted to spread this kind of propaganda through the mails, or use the mails for the purpose of disseminating propaganda to destroy the morale of our people.

That is the point I am trying to make—that there is no law on the statute books which deals with that question, and the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has not taken the trouble to look into it. I could submit to them a hundred other such publications which I believe are being used to undermine the faith of our people in some of their friends and neighbors. In time of war, when a united home front is essential, such publications can be accused of sabotage and treason.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman mean by "our people"?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The American people, of course. What does the gentleman think I mean?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know, the way he was talking.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All of us; you and me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know what you did mean.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman I am very much interested in the problem he is seeking to eliminate and that he is discussing; but I think the gentleman is quite unfair to the Postmaster General and the Post Office Department when he indicates that relief cannot be obtained pursuant to existing statutes. I am satisfied that the very relief he is asking for could be obtained if he had any proof whatsoever that these magazines are of the character he describes—and they ought to speak for themselves, the magazines are available—he should take those magazines down to the proper division of the Post Office Department and tell them he wants some action.

I am sure the gentleman is not in favor of Congress arbitrarily passing a law saying that such and such and such magazines shall be barred from the mails; is he?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What I am trying to convey to the membership today is that there ought to be a law to prevent misuse of the mails by groups which organize themselves for the sole purpose of disseminating propaganda amongst the American people to divide the American people. I say there ought to be some statute on the books to punish these people for misuse of the mails.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield to permit me to ask one more question along that line?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Would the gentleman go so far as to agree with me that we ought to eliminate from the pay rolls of the Government those who have banded themselves together for the purpose of burrowing into our Government and for the purpose of destroying our type of Government?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman knows I am with him on that; every American should be with him on that. We ought to expose all the groups that seek to destroy our democratic way of life.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I take it the gentleman will vote in that direction when the matter comes before the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will just wait he will find out. If I believe the gentleman has right and justice on his side I will support him; if I believe he does not have right and justice on his side I will vote against him. I always use my own judgment as to what I do.

The publications and magazines I am speaking about are put out by people who are known fascist agitators whose sole purpose is to divide our people. They set up certain organizations throughout the country and concentrate their efforts on launching attacks on certain minorities in this country. They do it in an underhanded manner and there is no law to stop them.

I submit to Congress that people who rent post-office boxes under fictitious names—if it is discovered that these people are irresponsible and not interested in the welfare of this country—should be prohibited from getting post-office boxes. They should be prevented from harming this country and our war efforts, and I do not care whether these people come from the left or the right. Those who seek to destroy the very fundamental principles upon which this country was founded should not be spared, no matter to which group they belong. I believe that the Dies committee, aside from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, can also do a splendid job if they would investigate the names I shall put in the Record under permission to extend my remarks. They could learn a great deal, because they have the power of subpoena. I do not believe the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads can do it.

It is the committee that has the power to subpoena these publishers. The people responsible for these publications ought to be brought in from anywhere to determine just exactly what they are trying to do.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman knows and is familiar with the fact that so far as these magazines, pamphlets, and brochures he is talking about that circulate through the mail are concerned, the pamphlet speaks for itself. If you have copies of those pamphlets that are circulating generally, or these magazines or brochures, and they are subversive in the least, the gentleman can take those down to the Post Office Department, where a department of that agency is established to deal specifically with that question, and they will issue an order to show cause.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman is going too far, because when he says "subversive," who is to determine that question?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, well, if you do not like the magazine and just want to take it out of the mail, that is one thing.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is going too far and too fast on this question. I have submitted a number of these problems to the Post Office Department, and there arises the question of free speech, free this, and free that. I tried to point out to you that these magazines are a menace to American

democracy. They give no information that will educate our people at all in the ways of democracy, but just seek to undermine our morale in one form or another. My good friend does not want me to go around the country and pick up all these magazines, and then go down there and present them in form of a complaint. I am giving you the general proposition. I do not think that we have given the Post Office Department enough law to cope with this whole situation. That is just my judgment.

Mr. KEEFE. Knowing the gentleman's intelligence on matters of this character and in reference to all matters, I know the gentleman would not make a charge that a magazine was preaching or sending out subversive material unless he had read the magazine or saw the magazine.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Some of them are published weekly. Some of them come out every month. I do not read all of them, but their policies and their standards are such as to convey their desire to build up fascism in this country.

Mr. KEEFE. I would think that the gentleman would not wait for a legislative process to go after them. If he has those magazines, take them down to the Post Office Department tomorrow, any one of them, and get some action. That is all the gentleman has to do.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am afraid you will have a tough time to get action.

Mr. KEEFE. They have barred hundreds of magazines from the mail.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; they have barred some newspapers and some articles, but there are many more that should not be given the mailing privilege.

I am calling your attention to the fact that certain publications and magazines are creating race prejudice, not only in your city and my city but all over the country, and I believe that is not in the best interest of this country.

At this point I wish to insert the list of publications I referred to. A few of them have been forced to close shop, but too many of them are still a menace to our home front:

PUBLICATIONS

The Defender is published in Wichita by Gerald B. Winrod.

The Octopus appears under the joint authorship of Elizabeth Dilling and Charles B. Hudson.

The Beacon Light is published by William Kullgren.

The Roll Call is a Pelley publication.

Weckruf und Beobachter (the Free American) is a bund publication.

Industrial Control Reports are published by James True.

World Service (Welt Dienst) is published at Erfurt, Germany, and is a Nazi propaganda bulletin.

Social Republic Society Bulletin (SOCIS) is published by David J. Baxter.

America in Danger! is published by Charles Hudson.

The Broom is published by C. Leon de Aryan.

Patriotic Research Bureau News Letter is published by Elizabeth Dilling.

Road to Victory is authored by George Sullivan, Washington, D. C.

Women Investors in America Bulletin is written by Catherine Curtis, New York City.

Constitutional Educational League Bulletin is written by Joseph Kamp, New Haven and New York City.

War Guilt and War Mongers is a publication by Eugene Santuary.

Revolution and the Fifth Column is a Santuary publication.

Edmondson's Economic Research Service is issued by Robert Edward Edmondson.

American Vigilante was written by Harry Jung, of Chicago.

Citizens No Foreign War Coalition Manual is issued by Oscar Brumback.

America Awake was written by Oscar Brumback.

Lord Lothian v. Lord Lothian is an address by the late Senator Lundeen, written by George Sylvester Viereck and published by Flanders Hall, Inc.

War, War, War was written by "Cincinnatus" and published by the Gibson Press, Washington, D. C.

The White Knight is a Deatherage publication and organ of the Knights of the White Camellia.

The Christian Free Press is a publication of Paquita de Shishmareff.

The National Liberty Party Bulletin is a publication of Frank W. Clark.

Friends of Progress is published by the organization, Friends of Progress.

The Revealer is a publication of Gerald B. Winrod.

Waters Flowing Eastward is a book written by Paquita de Shishmareff.

Liberation is a publication of William Dudley Pelley.

The Hidden Hand is a publication of William Dudley Pelley.

The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion is a forged anti-Semitic document circulated in the United States by Paquita de Shishmareff and others.

Books of the Hour are Flanders Hall publications.

Democracy on the Nile is a Viereck-Flanders Hall publication.

Double-Cross in Palestine is a Viereck-Flanders Hall publication.

Inhumanity Unlimited is a Viereck-Flanders Hall publication.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, generally I refrain from any comment on American foreign policy but the events of the past two days force all of us to speak. Permit me to quote a few of the headlines: The Washington Post of March 9 on its front page reads:

United States Aid Hidden From People of Russia, Standley charges.

The same evening the Washington Evening Star printed on its front page the headline:

Standley made Russian charges without authority, Welles says.

Another headline in the Evening Star reads:

Bloom describes Standley's statement as unfortunate. Soviet press carried full accounts of aid, Chairman of the House Committee declares.

The Washington Post of today carries this on its front page:

Moscow reporter on leave here says lend-lease figures were published in Pravda and that people knew all about United States aid.

Another item on the front page referring to a story on page 3 of the Post states:

Axis radios have a field day reporting friction among Allies.

A headline from London states that the Moscow radio last night broadcast in full the statement by United States Administrator E. R. Stettinius. The New York Times of January 23 reported that Pravda published the figures of aid given. From press reports it would appear that the speeches of Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt as well as other major war officials concerning aid to Russia have been carried in the Soviet press.

My friends, something very strange has happened here, something of the utmost importance. I do not think that we in the House can brush lightly over this incident.

We have been sending aid to Russia. We have been sending it for one very simple reason. Let us be blunt. Every Russian lost is an American life saved. They are giving with their blood. We are giving them equipment to fight with. All of us understand this. I personally am convinced that we must give more aid not only in tanks and guns but with offensive military action in Europe and give it now.

We understand the need of fighting this war with a common strategy. How then was it possible for our Ambassador in Russia to make such a charge which the facts do not bear out and from what we are told, he made the statement without any consultation with the President or with the State Department.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any information as to how it happened that the Office of War Information or the Government censorship gave the green light to Admiral Standley's comments if they did not have the approval of the State Department?

Mr. BENDER. That is exactly what I am coming to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How does the gentleman tie in Admiral Standley's statement with the statement made by Vice President WALLACE that there is danger that the United States may double-cross Russia?

Mr. BENDER. All of this baffles me. That is why I am making this statement now. If this is true, then we cannot avoid the conclusion that our Ambassador in Russia has acted in a reprehensible and entirely irresponsible manner.

However, it is not conceivable that Admiral Standley did not talk to or consult with the members of our State Department staff in Russia. Who is on that staff? Who keeps Admiral Standley informed in Russia of what goes on in the Soviet press? With whom did Admiral Standley consult when he was in America

recently? Did he consult with our former Soviet Ambassador, Mr. William Bullitt, who is noted for his hatred of the Russians?

Mr. William Bullitt is now in the Navy Department. What function he serves there I do not know but it would be desirable, I think, to know whether William Bullitt, now at the Navy Department, had any consultations with Admiral Standley when the admiral was home recently.

It is a matter of interest in this matter that Mr. Loy W. Henderson who was with Mr. Bullitt in Moscow as an Attaché, is now in charge of the Soviet desk at the State Department. It is reliably reported that Mr. Henderson shares with Bullitt his anti-Soviet opinions.

My fellow colleagues, I cannot believe that Admiral Standley's statement was an accident. Someone either in our own State Department or in the Navy or in our Embassy in Moscow knew what he was doing when he misinformed Admiral Standley of the internal situation in Russia or deliberately persuaded Admiral Standley that it was desirable to make such a statement.

This is a serious matter. It might have cost the United States a million lives except for the good sense of Sumner Welles and of the Members of this House and the Senate.

I am particularly moved by this outrageous indiscretion because it is the climax to a series of foreign policy incidents with which the American people in my opinion do not agree. The recent speech of our Ambassador to Spain, Mr. Hayes, in which he revealed that we were subsidizing a government which is actively recruiting divisions to fight against one of our allies was, I must admit, a genuine shock to me. It shocked me even further to discover that the British Ambassador to Madrid, Samuel Hoare, the original appeaser of the Chamberlain group and past collaborator of Pierre Laval, held back on agreeing to a \$100,000,000 loan to Franco which Ambassador Hayes wanted to grant without any restrictions or agreement from the Spanish Government of any kind.

Frankly, the entire Darlan-Giraud episode does not sit well with the American people. The fact that several thousand political prisoners who were put in jail because of their fight against fascism still remain in prison in north Africa is a matter of the utmost concern to this House.

For my part, I am convinced that the American people will not tolerate our State Department's continuing relationships with the appeasement groups, and with Fascist sympathizers. So far as I can tell, only the Secretary of State and Mr. Sumner Welles in the State Department have heard of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." It seem to have no effect whatsoever on the bureaucracy in the State Department.

Personally, I am thoroughly sick of the near disasters to which certain elements in the State Department have brought this Nation. I believe that it is high time that this Congress undertook a searching investigation of our State Department. We should carefully review

the history, the connections, and the attitudes of the State Department bureaucracy. I am moved to introduce a resolution to undertake such an investigation, that committee to be composed of the majority and minority leaders of the House and the five ranking members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

In addition, it is my opinion that Mr. Robert Murphy should be recalled from north Africa, Ambassador Hayes should be removed from Madrid and that Admiral Standley should be recalled from Moscow. How on earth the Soviet people and the Soviet leaders can trust an American Ambassador who makes irresponsible statements, without consulting his State Department, and which are contrary to the facts, I cannot for the life of me see. Every day that Admiral Standley stays in Moscow will weaken our position with Russia.

We may as well face the fact that this type of situation is intolerable and that it has got to be cleaned up. It endangers our war effort. It may cost us many American lives. The American people are not going to tolerate this type of intrigue. A housecleaning is in order, gentlemen, and I propose that it be undertaken now.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 8 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this additional time because it seems to me that Admiral Standley has been unjustifiably criticized here on the floor of the House. I have known Admiral Standley for a great many years. I have known him intimately as a man of the highest character and integrity. As far as I know, no one questions his honesty and the truth of the statement he made. The question is one of propriety. I am not going to discuss that because I do not have enough knowledge of the situation. However, I believe the whole thing is a tempest in a teapot. If Admiral Standley told the truth, there is no harm in the American people knowing the facts. If he did not tell the truth, then he should be repudiated and recalled. He may not have used diplomatic language, but sometimes plain speaking or bluntness is the best diplomacy.

I do not believe anyone should take the floor of the House and question the honesty, integrity, and veracity of Admiral Standley until we know the facts. We do not know what was said or carried in the press of Russia half as well as Admiral Standley. No Member of Congress, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the gentleman who has just spoken, or anyone else, knows what has transpired in the Russian press. Certainly I do not know. I have not the faintest idea what was or was not published in the Russian press.

But I have known Admiral Standley for many years and am willing to take his word on the Russian situation against anyone in America. He was one of the outstanding admirals in our Navy and held one of the most important positions in the World's Fair in New York and is a man of the loftiest character, highest ideals, and unquestioned integrity. I hope nobody means either directly or indirectly to challenge the integrity, the honesty, or the veracity of Admiral Standley. The question of the propriety or diplomatic tact is another matter, which I am not prepared to discuss.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is certainly in favor of investigating this matter. I read the charges that were made by the State Department itself regarding Admiral Standley's statement. Is it not a fact that the State Department repudiated it?

Mr. FISH. Under Secretary Welles said he had not consulted with the State Department before releasing his statement. That is a matter of propriety, not of truth. I am one of those who have been arguing in this House all the time for our committees and even our Ambassadors to present the facts and the truth to the American people. Let them have the facts, let them determine the policies. If it is the truth, then no harm has been done to anybody. If it is not the truth, I am in favor of repudiating him and calling him home.

Mr. BENDER. The truth is exactly what we are trying to get.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has been quite customary to break tradition during the past 10 years. Is it not a fact that an Ambassador is the President's personal representative and that he might have consulted the President without going to the State Department?

Mr. FISH. That is very possible. I have no knowledge of the facts. But he certainly is the personal appointee and representative of the President and has direct contact with the President.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to enlighten me on this subject.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has touched on the matter of propriety. I assume part of the duty and function of the War Censorship Office is to consider the matter of propriety so this Office must have considered that aspect also when it O. K'd Admiral Standley's speech. In that connection, I should like to quote from a speech of Vice President WALLACE as reported in the Times-Herald of this morning, March 10, 1943. It seems that Vice President WALLACE was speaking on a national hook-up in this country at the same time Admiral Standley

was speaking in Moscow. I should like to have the gentleman's reaction to this statement by Vice President WALLACE. I quote:

Without a close and trusting understanding between Russia and the United States there is grave probability—

Note the word "probability"; not "possibility"—

there is grave probability of Russia and Germany sooner or later making a common cause.

It seems to me that is an unfortunate and inflammatory remark to come from the Vice President of the United States at a time like this, in speaking about one of our allies in this war. This is the type of remark that brings about disunity and distrust among partners in this war. Vice President WALLACE also said something about isolationism in this same speech. It seems to me that when the Vice President occupies himself broadcasting doubt-creating and disunity-breeding speeches about international double-crossing and about a probable alliance between Russia and Germany he is himself practicing very much more dangerous forms of isolationism than anything he preaches against in his speech. Anybody in wartime who seeks to isolate one ally from another by doubt-stirring comments such as Mr. WALLACE made is indeed practicing a form of isolationism which is full of danger. I wonder if the gentleman does not agree with me that such speeches come under the classification of being entirely beyond the bounds of propriety.

Mr. FISH. I not only believe it is lacking in propriety, but if the gentleman would go a little further and refer to the remarks made by the Vice President that we might double-cross Soviet Russia, made at the same time he made the remarks referred to, then not only was that unwise and unfriendly, but in my opinion it was an infamous remark and challenged the integrity and the honesty of the Government of the United States, whether Republican or Democratic or New Deal. We never had any idea of double-crossing any nation, and never will have, no matter what administration, New Deal or anti-New Deal, may be in power, and anyone who infers that we perhaps might double-cross Soviet Russia or any nation when we have never done so in our entire history and never propose to, is making an unwarranted and an infamous remark.

When we come to the other matter, I have not the slightest idea what the foreign policy of Soviet Russia is, whether there is any chance whatever of her lining up with Hitler or with the Nazis. I hope to goodness there is not. I have no knowledge of it and I do not want to be put in the position of intimating that is in the mind of Stalin or the Communist Party in Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman agree that even though this country is in desperate need of food, we would rather have the Vice President talking about his pet phobia of killing little pigs and plowing under cotton and wheat

rather than talking about this country double-crossing Russia and about Russia double-crossing us?

Mr. FISH. He has already talked too much about killing little pigs and plowing under crops. He also made the statement that there is a great deal of isolationist propaganda throughout the country, and that it is sweeping the Nation, and he predicted that it will lead us into a third World War. I call the attention of the House on both sides to the fact that we have only gotten into two World Wars in our entire history, one under a Democratic administration and in its second term, and the other one under a New Deal administration, and in its second term. We got into those World Wars, one under Woodrow Wilson, a Democratic administration, and one under Franklin D. Roosevelt, a New Deal administration, and that we never got into any World War under a Republican administration, and yet it is now charged by the Vice President that isolationism is sweeping America and leading us into a third World War. It just does not make sense.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. In view of what the gentleman has said, does not the gentleman feel that we are entitled to the truth, that the American people are entitled to the truth?

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman is right. If he is after the truth, then he is talking the same doctrine I am. I am after the facts and the truth. Let the American people know the truth; they are entitled to it if we are to remain a free nation. I am not interested in internationalism or nationalism, or isolationism. I am interested in what is best for America. There is no living man who can tell me what is best for America, until we have won this war. Nobody can tell what the attitude of these other nations will be until the war is won, and until that occurs, I am not making up my mind as to how to organize or rule the world in the future. I want to make sure of the best interest of America first, last, and all the time, and that is the only guide that I know of at any time, whether it is isolationism, nationalism, or internationalism.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY. It would seem to me that the attitudes of these other nations at the end of the war, or during the war depend to a great extent upon our attitude. A quotation was made or was read from the Vice President in which he said, if I got it correctly, that if our actions are of a certain nature, it is probable that Soviet Russia and Germany will take certain action. That is no guess.

Some people know history, some people know the relationship of the nations when they are playing the game of power politics. Some Americans know that we did run out on the peace after the last war; that the isolationism that existed

for 20 years was one of the major causes of the second World War, and it would seem to me that the words here expressed in respect to the Vice President's remarks, that he was trying to stir up suspicion in our country against Russia or in Russia against the United States—

Mr. FISH. I did not make that statement.

Mr. McMURRAY. I understand that perfectly well, but it seems to me that certain statements should not go unchallenged, but there are conclusions that can be drawn from the actions and reactions of nations, and I should like to say one more thing, that it is my humble opinion—and I think I know a little about this subject—that if we go isolationist after this war, we will find confusion in perhaps all of the other great nations' states, and that is no guess.

Mr. FISH. May I say to the gentleman, and I think I may astound some of my friends on both sides of the House, that I am not an isolationist.

I believe I am supposed to be one of the outstanding isolationists. I was a noninterventionist against our being involved in war unless attacked. I did everything in my power to keep this country out of war. I have never been an isolationist. I have always believed in and advocated international cooperation. If I had been in the House—I stepped out for a few minutes—I would have offered to attach the entire Atlantic Charter to the lend-lease bill. I did not get a chance to offer it as an amendment and that is why I asked for this time. I am introducing today a joint resolution endorsing the principles of the Atlantic Charter so that it will be before the Congress. To my mind, it is nothing but a scrap of paper at the present time. It is merely a joint declaration of the President of the United States and Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, made on board a ship somewhere at sea 4 months before we entered the war. We are now in the war. Conditions have entirely changed. I believe in the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and would like to see them endorsed by Congress so that all foreign nations will know that Congress has acted favorably upon them. Now it will be up to Congress. I am for international cooperation, and for that reason I am introducing the entire Atlantic Charter as written for consideration and approval by Congress.

I will give my right arm now—or at any time in the past 20 years I would have given it—to maintain world peace. I want to win this war; I want to crush our enemies; I want to disarm Japan and Germany; I want to destroy their armies. I am willing to police them with our own air and task forces, if necessary, for a few years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I want not only to disarm them, but after we have won the war—and we are going to win the war; we are getting stronger all the time—after we disarm them, then police them for a while, but I do not want any Versailles Treaty. I do not want any treaty that is going to create another war 20 years from now. I do not want to take an inch of territory from any nation to which it rightfully belongs and then have another cause for war 20 years from now. I want a just and lasting peace. There is not anything I would not do to bring it about. But if there is going to another Versailles Treaty, naturally I will oppose it. Bring about a just and lasting peace and there will be international cooperation. I hope Russia and all the rest of our allies will see eye to eye with us.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am disturbed by the implication which the gentleman makes that the party of which I am a member, be it Democrat or Democrat New Deal Party, is a war party.

Mr. FISH. I would not want to put it that way, but your Vice President deliberately stated, and it is in reply to him that I was speaking, that isolationism is sweeping the country, and would involve us in a third World War. Let us win this war first before starting another. Certainly if I know anything about internationalism or isolationism, the New Deal and the recent Democratic Party were and are internationally inclined. That is one of the reasons why the American people opposed the Versailles Treaty—and the League of Nations, which was a part of it. That type of peace breeds wars and always will. I am opposed to that type of peace and internationalism. I was only replying, in my remarks, to the Vice President. He is the Vice President of the New Deal party and as such speaks with a certain amount of authority.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As a Democrat I do not believe that we are a war party. We may have to deal with a war, and in dealing with that war we will fight side by side with Republicans to win the war.

Mr. FISH. I think that is right so far as the gentleman is concerned. I mean, it is a fair statement. I was replying to the Vice President and the intimations that go along with it. At the same time it is true that we have never entered a world war under a Republican administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be extremely helpful if under lend-lease they had a board which consisted of the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia, and also another board consisting of the United States, Great Britain, and China?

Mr. FISH. Is that for lend-lease alone?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. At least, Russia could sit in around the table and discuss things.

Mr. FISH. I go further than the distinguished lady from Massachusetts. I have advocated in this House heretofore that we have a supreme command, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, all on equal terms; have a supreme war council just as we had in the last war. I agree it would be the proper thing to do to have lend-lease come under all four nations. We are in a common war with a common objective, and that objective is to win the war at the earliest possible moment with the least losses. Of course, anything that will bring it about, either through a lend-lease board or a supreme war council, which is more important, is what we should do and do immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of little consequence because the temper of the House was such that I do not believe any amendments would have been adopted to the lend-lease bill, but I had three amendments that I intended to offer and in fairness to those to whom I had stated I would offer them I have to apologize and say that I was out of the House for exactly 3 minutes and when I returned the bill was passed. I thought there would be another hour to consider amendments. The temper of the House was such that probably none of my amendments would have been adopted. One was the endorsement of the Atlantic Charter. I am now introducing it as a separate resolution. The other one I will read:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, the Food Administrator is hereby empowered to prohibit any part of the lease-lend food shipments, exclusive of food for our own armed forces, that he deems necessary to protect the morale, health, and food supply of the people of the United States.

I think the Food Administrator ought to have that power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I contend the Food Administrator ought to have that power because we may have a very serious food shortage and a food crisis by the end of this year and the power and responsibility to meet it ought to rest with the Food Administrator. I will make some remarks on that later under the farm price bill.

The other amendment might not have been germane and probably would not have passed; I am now putting it in as a separate resolution because I think it should be discussed now and not later on after the war is over. It is to the effect that the Congress of the United States favors the permanent acquisition of the strategic islands in possession of European nations from Bermuda to South America for air and naval bases as a reciprocal part of the lease-lend program.

I want to say to the House that if we debated this issue openly and found American public opinion was behind it after we presented all the facts, it would

be our duty to say to Great Britain that "we are primarily interested in our own national security; we are interested in our own national defense and our own protection just the way you are."

I want to say to the House that I admire the British; I also admire Soviet Russia. I admire them because they stand for their own interests all the time. The British Government stands for the British Empire first; the Soviet Government stands for Russia first. It would seem to me now that we are in this war and putting everything behind the war to win it that we should openly discuss this important question of acquiring the islands off our eastern coast permanently as air and naval bases. If this war has proved anything at all it has proved the value of the airplane for defensive purposes. The only 2 great victories we have won have been as a result of land-based airplanes. I submit in the interest of national defense, in the interest of our own protection and security, we should tell Great Britain that we want these islands off our coasts; that they are of no particular use to her; that we want them for our own defense, for the future, not for 99 years—this country is not a 99-year country. America, we hope, is going on forever and we want to protect this country with naval and air bases on these strategic islands from Bermuda to South America.

I do not believe in going in by the back door; I do not believe in sneaking into the peace conference and saying: "We want these islands after it is all over." I believe in bringing these facts up now, showing our interest in them and saying: "This would be reciprocal lend-lease; they are of no particular value to you, but are of vital importance to us." That is what I should like to discuss when this resolution comes before the House, not as an anti-British resolution, but as a pro-American resolution in the interest of the security of America today and the America of the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAVAGAN). The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a poem, The Battle Hymn of the Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate on this day, Ash Wednesday, to call the attention of the Seventy-eighth Congress to the one-hundred and forty-first anniversary of the founding of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. Never before in our history has the significance of this great national institution been stronger in our minds; never before have we, whose duty it is to nominate the cadets

for appointments to West Point, held sterner responsibility.

The United States Military Academy is an institution established by the Government for the practical and theoretical training of young men for the military service.

That sentence is a direct quotation from the Handbook of Information Relative to the Appointment and Admission of Cadets. But West Point is more than that. We might truthfully say that it is an institution established by the Government for the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual development of a highly specialized type of youth, for the direct and all-important purpose of winning and preserving the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which constitute the inheritance of every American citizen.

Columbia, Georgetown, Harvard, Yale, and all our other great institutions of learning belong to the Nation in a general sense in that each one contributes deeply and capably to national culture. But West Point belongs to the Nation in a more intimate sense, for every American citizen has a personal share in it and every American heart quickens at the sound of *The Caissons Go Rolling Along*.

The impressive and beautiful fortresses of the academy stand stalwart upon the battlements of the Palisades of the great Hudson River. And, just as stalwartly, West Point as an institution stands for militant Christianity. It is the very symbol of the courageous and valiant strength—strength of body and mind, of heart and soul—which must and will carry us on to victory. That strength is nurtured and bulwarked, day after day, into the finest of our selected youths until no battle shock or terror of war, no hardship, no personal or national calamity can sway them from their chosen way of life.

The other day, in announcing the tremendous triumph of the Bismarck Sea, Gen. Douglas MacArthur proclaimed that this great battle was fought and won through the help of a divine and merciful Providence. Contrast this, for a moment, with the statement in the manual of instructions issued to every private in the German Army:

It is the duty of the German soldier to destroy the cross.

That contrast is as obvious as the blow of a pole ax, and as effectively simple. One scarcely need say more. General MacArthur invokes the aid of God; General Eisenhower, stationed amid the bloody sands of Tunisia, seeks daily guidance in his Bible, and Gen. George Washington prayed on his knees in the snow at Valley Forge. Men of character and courage, like George Washington, our first Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief of the trying times of today, and our generals in the field, have always sought and found the strength, inspiration, and fortitude to meet and overcome the ravages of war and the treachery of men. And may it always be the way of our leaders.

"All they that take the sword shall perish by the sword" is but half the truth for the men of West Point. Many have

perished by the sword; many more will perish before the present world conflagration comes to an end. But many will win the peace, and will preserve it as sacredly as they now fight for it. Our heroes must and will be represented at the peace conferences; they must and will sit at the tables where a better way of life for mankind is resolved. Our heroes must not only plan this way of life, they must and will sustain it.

The Christ who scourged the money-changers from the temple was wise and merciful; likewise he was courageous with the courage of His convictions. That is the same Christ whose wisdom and mercy and courage goes like a banner before the men of West Point, yesterday, today, tomorrow, and forever.

In another time, perilous to the state of our Nation, the following words were spoken and sung, as they still are, throughout the Union. Let us recall them today:

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord:

He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;

He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword:

His truth is marching on.

I have seen Him in the watch-fires of a hundred circling camps;

They have builded Him an altar in the evening dews and damps;

I can read His righteous sentence by the dim and flaring lamps;

His day is marching on.

He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat;

He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment-seat:

Oh! be swift, my soul, to answer Him! be jubilant, my feet!

Our God is marching on.

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,

With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me:

As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,

While God is marching on.

This is not a year for parades, bright banners, and long speeches, nor will there be more, at West Point, than a quiet ceremonial observance of the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the founding of the academy. There will be a prayer, music by the academy band and choir, and a few brief addresses from some of the illustrious men who have enjoyed the privilege of attendance at the academy, and who are now making it possible for us to enjoy the privileges of a free America. I intend, as I hope every one of you will, to listen to the radio broadcast of this ceremony on the evening of Saturday, March 13. According to present arrangements, you will hear talks, either directly or by short wave, from 12 of our United States Army generals stationed the world over, from Australia to Africa and from Alaska to Iceland: General Marshall, our Chief of Staff; Major General Wilby, superintendent of the academy; General Eisenhower; Lieutenant Generals Krueger, Andrews, and Patton; and Major Generals Buckner, Burgin, and Ward.

And while we are listening to this in-

spiring program, I know that we will each have in mind some young man whom we are considering for an appointment to the academy. I know, too, that our hearts will swell with pride in the thought of the brave young men whom we have appointed in previous years, some of whom are even now on the field of battle.

Not long ago I read a rare tribute to a proud and ancient people, which, in its simplicity, nobility, and truth, might have been written of the gallant men of West Point:

To be shaken and yet not moved, to suffer attacks yet not be overcome, that is your character. Your courage is stronger than your rock or mountains.

Over the gateway of the tyranny of the "new order" one may read, written large in letters of blood, that ominous warning:

Abandon hope, all ye who enter here.

But on the hinges of the great doors leading into the chapel at West Point these words appear:

O God, who dost crush out war, and by Thy powerful defense dost defeat the assailant of them that trust in Thee, come to the help of Thy servants, who implore Thy mercy.

141ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, REMARKS BY GENERAL EISENHOWER MARCH 13, 1943

One month ago tonight an American detachment held a high hill above the Faid Pass in Central Tunisia. It was commanded by Johnny Waters, a West Pointer of the class of '31. He was ordered to hold that hill.

He then had been engaged for 3 months in almost continuous battle, in every hour of which he lived up to the glowing prophecies made concerning him from the first day that he began his career at West Point.

At first light on February 14th, the enemy poured in around his flanks and quickly he was surrounded by hostile mechanized forces. Undismayed, he carried on. For 2 nights and days he repulsed every attempt of the Hun to dent his position. Then the corps commander directed Waters to bring his troops back through the darkness to join the main American force. Efficiently and rapidly he organized for the withdrawal. His troops came out with 150 prisoners and joined the main body, while Johnny Waters—as you would expect—stayed with a small detachment to cover the retirement. His devoted men wanted all to stay until he himself should depart, but he had made them soldiers that obeyed orders instantly.

Since that moment we have not heard of Johnny Waters and his men. Wherever he is, whatever his fate, his example and his whole career typify the kind of service that West Point has a right to expect of her graduates. He knew his job and he devoted his full energies and his whole spirit to its execution.

If that spirit and example are characteristic today of West Pointers in every duty to which assigned, then our alma mater is a shining symbol of that Americanism that will win the war—definitely and conclusively. If there could be granted to me now an answer to just one prayer, it would be this: "God, let me, in my post, do my duty to my country as well as Johnny Waters did in his."

FOOD REQUIREMENTS UNDER LEND-LEASE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is almost a complete unanimity of opinion on the necessity of extending the life of lend-lease for 1 year by this Congress. All are not agreed as to the details in the administration of the act, improvements can and should be made to the end that the Members of this House may be fully informed of its entire scope if future extensions are deemed necessary. I shall vote for the bill on the ground that it is a vital part of our national defense at this time.

I have read with a great deal of interest the report submitted to the Congress by the Administrator, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and a portion of the hearings. I desire at this time to call attention to a very important phase of that report dealing with the essential part that food is and will play in effecting the objectives of lease-lend policy. The Administrator, on page 42, states very emphatically:

Food is a weapon of war. In its way it is as essential to the winning of the war as planes or guns.

I hope we all get the full significance of that strong statement and that it can be driven home to those Government bureaus who still have not comprehended the seriousness of our food situation. Listen again to Mr. Stettinius for on page 45 of his report he states:

The lend-lease food program for 1943 will take a much bigger share of many of these products than it did in 1942.

"How, Mr. Administrator," I ask, "can you expect a bigger share of food products in 1943 as compared to 1942, when it appears to be a verity that less food will be produced this year than last?"

Mr. Speaker, the food program under lend-lease is being sabotaged, inadvertently or otherwise by the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board by politics and dilatory tactics which is resulting in a curtailment of food production.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that the Department of Agriculture is more concerned in saving the A. A. A., the Farm Security Administration, and the Commodity Credit Corporation than it is in organizing a productive food program. The Department is aware that Congress is opposed to subsidies and incentive payments and is suspicious of the activities of the agencies I have here named. So Mr. Wickard and his associates apparently decide that they will take the fight to the people in the field; they authorize and sanction meetings of farmers presided over by A. A. A. State committeemen, who are on the Government pay rolls at \$4,600 to \$4,800 per year. At these meetings prepared speeches are read, and I dare to bet a hat, they are prepared in Washington. Congressmen, the farm bloc Congressmen, if there is such a group, are accused of an attempt to destroy those agencies. The farmers are urged, yes begged, to protest to you about this situation.

This is not fancy or fiction, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact, and I cite a specific case. On February 22, 1943, one R. C. Schultz, a triple-A committeeman from my State, and an employee of the Department of Agriculture at \$4,600 a year, released to the press a talk that has been broadcast throughout Wisconsin.

So that every Member may read the kind of propaganda the Department is dishing out, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the talk by Mr. Schultz, of A. A. A., be incorporated herein:

I suppose you are wondering why you committeemen were called together today! You may be thinking that there has been a change in the procedure and that you are going to hear all the new changes that have taken place and that you can go out and inform your community committeemen what they may be. But if you expect that this meeting has been called for the purpose that I have indicated above, you have a surprise coming to you.

There comes a time in the life of any organization when it has to adopt a stand and decide whether or not it is going to run its own program or whether it is going to turn it over to some other group. Most of you men have been connected with this organization for many years and you have done a good job of handling the procedure end of the farm program. But now, the real reason for all of us being either elected or selected is coming to the top.

Our administration of this program has been challenged and we have to prove our worth. In order to give you a background of what has developed and is developing, it will be necessary to go back several years.

I think all of you know, and if you don't I'm going to tell you now, that your Farm Bureau, and extension organization have been wanting to run the farm program ever since it was first conceived. Then, Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace decided that the business of agriculture should be run by farmers themselves, through the election of county and community committeemen. Bringing us a little closer up to the present time, through a coalition of our powerful industrial groups, the Farm Bureau organization and Extension Service, a farm bloc of Congressmen and Senators was developed. These forces that I mentioned before know well enough that in order to obtain control of the business of agriculture, there was only one way that it could be done and that was through political maneuvering, and the farm bloc was the result of that kind of work.

If you remember, last year prior to the time that the appropriation bill came up for a final vote, a rider was attached to it. This rider denied the privilege of the farmers themselves to make full use of the ever-normal granary—in other words, this rider, supported by Farm Bureau and by Extension Service in the interests of the big grain speculators, limited the amount of feed wheat that could be sold out of the farmers' own ever-normal granary to 125,000,000 bushels. When that amount had been sold, the remainder would have to be sold at parity prices, irrespective of the fact that the farmer who had raised the wheat had already received a full measure of value for it. What lay back of that move?

It's very simple. Powerful groups in this country had used the leaders of the Farm Bureau and their "yes men," the Extension Service, to exert pressure on Congress to prevent the sale of wheat at a figure that would have enabled dairy, poultry, and livestock producers to have a fair margin of profit without raising the price of those products to the consumer beyond his ability to pay.

In other words, this group said that the principles of the ever normal granary were no good, as far as they were concerned, and

the action taken at that time, which will be effective now, will throw the entire grain supplies in the United States into the hands of the speculators, and dairy and poultry farmers will pay through the nose for the raw materials that are being used to produce the butter and eggs and cheese, etc.

What is that going to do to your dairy farmers in the State of Wisconsin?

Well here are a few figures on it. Commodity Credit Corporation wheat has an average sale value in this State of around 92 cents a bushel. If the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to sell the remainder of it, or approximately 275,000,000 bushels, at parity prices, feed wheat will disappear entirely from the menus of our poultry, hog, and dairy farms, because the parity price on wheat today is \$1.39 per bushel and no farmer could feed wheat at that price.

Let's follow that through a little ways: What would happen? Certainly the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be able to hold this wheat for the farmer-cooperators. The farmer himself could not purchase it at that price, so that the result would be this: It would have to be released to the grain trade, who could manipulate the price of wheat foods and on other foods to a level comparable to the level they were during the last World War.

It has been conservatively estimated that that action alone would add \$1 to every \$5 that the farmer now pays for his necessary feed grains. Let's see what that would cost in total to Wisconsin farmers.

In 1942 there was approximately \$33,000,000 spent for food purchases in this State, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics' figures. Twenty percent of \$33,000,000 is about \$7,000,000. That's the minimum amount that farm people would have to pay, more, for their food that they buy—the sky would be the limit on the other side . . . they may pay 50 percent more.

Well, maybe the question in your mind right now is this: "Well, that's alright." You may be thinking in terms of what the Farm Bureau has advocated. "Run this food up; run the price of dairy products up—let the man who has the swollen war wages pay the cost. Why worry about whether we can save this democracy. Let's get while the getting's good. That's one good way that we can take a rap at organized labor. We don't care whether they live or die—what's the difference—let's get it!"

That's the attitude of some of our farm organization leaders. That's the attitude of our industrial leaders and a good share of these top-flight extension boys. But I don't think that you farm people, you committeemen, should be swayed by any such shallow thinking. In the first place, let's not forget that over half of the city people of this country are not working in war industries and are not receiving wartime salaries and are not in a position to pay a dollar a pound for butter. And this country, as a whole, is not in any position where we can afford inflation. It will lick us quicker than Hitler will. And I think you men realize that.

But still, the farm bloc, in an attempt to destroy what has been built up since 1933 and which has proven its worth and value beyond any shadow of a doubt—in fact, has been in principle approved and placed in the platform of the Republican Party, both in 1936 and 1940—the farm bloc, farm bureau, and extension service are now saying it should be thrown out of the window.

To bring you a little closer up to date on this whole picture, right into the 1943 food-for-freedom campaign: The Secretary of Agriculture has gone to Congress and has made a plea to Congress to make an appropriation for the purpose of making incentive payments to farmers who are planting, or who are intending to plant, war crops. And again the unholy coalition of big industry, farm bureau and extension have thrown their

weight upon the farm bloc and have been able to swing the subcommittee of the Agricultural Committee in Washington to veto the proposal to make incentive payments for the production of needed war crops. They have said, and I quote: "Give the farmer top prices and let the consumer pay. We don't want a subsidy," according to the self-appointed spokesmen for agriculture.

Now you know that they are driving another nail into the coffin of triple A, and what are you going to do about it? I wonder if we couldn't stop right here and go back to the days of 1930-32, when farm people, who were the most law-abiding people that could be found anywhere, got into a position where they decided that the law of self-preservation was the only one that counted any more, and judges were dragged off their judicial chairs. Do you remember what Farm Bureau and Extension Service did at that time?

Well, if you don't, I'm going to tell you. They sat on the sidelines and said, "Yes; this is pretty tough, but we don't know what to do about it."

Many extension agents at that time wore out pencil after pencil trying to figure out how you and I as farmers could make some money with 65-cent milk and \$2 hogs.

The reason I am telling you this right now is that the forces that are at work at this time, this "unholy alliance" that I mentioned before, will get us into that same position after this war is over if they can destroy your farm program. The methods that have been used so successfully by Hitler are being used here today. The idea of "divide and conquer"—first to divide the farmers among themselves and, second, to divide farmers and laboring people. And back of that whole thing is a sinister move to get farm people out on their own again.

You have heard many a man in opposition to this idea of an agricultural equality and a national farm program say that all we want is to have the farmers left alone. They had been left alone during the 1920's and you all know the results. It may be interesting to you to know now that there are movements under way that have shown up in various parts of the country. For instance, the Idaho State Legislature recently passed a resolution recommending that the triple A be discontinued. A rider was attached to the amendment in Washington and was ruled down on a point of order that the same thing be done. And Congress almost had an opportunity to vote on whether there should be a triple A farm program now. Did you ever realize what that would mean to our food-production program? Did you ever stop to think that our industrial set-up in this country has borrowed, lock, stock, and barrel, the ideas from triple A, and all of a sudden there are whisperings and rumors going around and actual attempts being made to discontinue the work of an organization that is the only group in this whole United States that can get the needed production of food? Triple A has the mechanism, the personnel, and without it the American people are going to go hungry.

I am not sure but that this "divide and conquer" method that is being used may prolong the war and bring on much greater suffering than we have ever dreamed of before. The right of you people as farmers to run your own business is being challenged. The issue is clear—make no mistake about it. The farm bloc, the Farm Bureau, and Extension Service is saying that you, as farmers, have not got enough brains to run your own business; but it must be run for you by "technically trained" theoretical experts. Let me ask you: Do the bankers' association or the manufacturers' groups go out and get somebody else in to tell them how to run their business?

You bet your sweet life they don't. They run their own business and they want to run yours, too. Don't ever forget that.

The decision as to whether you are going to run your own business or whether somebody else is going to run it rests with you. I don't believe that you can be honest with yourselves if you say that you, as an individual, can go home. I know you are making sacrifices staying on the job that you are in. We all are doing that. There's something much deeper and much more fundamental in this thing. Are we going to come through this national crisis we are in with an organization that is able to, first, produce the food, and, second, keep our hands on the throttle of inflation; with an organization that, when the period of reconstruction comes, will be a power and a force, or are we going to fold up here and say that we haven't got what it takes to represent and run this business of agriculture, and we must turn it over to men who will tell us what to do?

There is the issue.

Now it isn't going to do any good for me to tell you this and you not take any action. You have a powerful group of people who are waiting to help you and they are not in Washington, either. They are the consuming public out here, who are for you, lock, stock, and barrel. They are the labor organizations who are for you and the reason they are for you is because they want food and at a reasonable price. The prices that will permit you to make a fair profit. A price that will allow no place for any speculator to fatten himself at the expense of both you and the consumer. Take advantage of that group of American citizens, who are placing Democracy above material gain and you will be in a position to help your people cooperatively write us a peace when this war is over that will be a lasting one.

I wonder how many of you people have noticed in some of the newspapers, especially those that are controlled by the powerful monopolized groups, the statements that have been made in columns and editorials that no man should think in terms of the post-war period now, but we should win this war first. Do you realize what they are attempting to do? They are attempting to stop people from thinking, if you please, because the thinking group of people cannot be hoodwinked as easily as those who do not think, and when the war is over, they can put over their ideas of what kind of a peace we should make and the dollar sign is going to be the most prominent thing on the peace table.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, has attempted to be decent to the farm bloc-Farm Bureau-Extension Service coalition. And every time that they had an opportunity, they drove a knife into his back. They have said this: That it doesn't make any difference how we do it, we are going to gain control over this business of agriculture. We are going to take over the farm program. We don't care what way we do it, just as long as we can do it.

Claude R. Wickard has made his mind up now—he is going to find out how many friends he has among the farm people, and how many committeemen have got the necessary guts to go on out and fight for farmer control. And let me bring this to your attention.

If the farmer-controlled, farmer-committeeman system of Triple-A is successful in putting over this production battle, they will have shown that they are capable of running their own business, and the hold of the Extension Service, the Farm Bureau, and the farm bloc on this vast business of Agriculture will be broken once and for all.

That's the issue.

That's the thing that Claude Wickard is asking you farm people and you committeemen to back him up on. Have you got the guts to do it?

The answer, to me, is "Yes, you have." There is no time or place for a coward in

this battle for the rights of farm people to run their own business, any more than there is a time and place for a coward in Guadalcanal or Africa. You and I cannot sit on the fence now—we'll have to get off—either on one side or the other, because the principles of Henry Wallace, Claude Wickard, and the men who had the vision and the courage to see that agriculture could never have a place in the sun until they ran their own business is being attacked. Let me quote to you right now from the speech of Dr. James Hoskins, president of the University of Tennessee, delivered at the land-grant college and extension directors' meeting October 28, 1942. I quote: Dr. Hoskins says that farm to farm educational work now performed by elected farmer committeemen should be turned back to the colleges and a speedy return to the day of absolute agricultural college supremacy should be the first objective of agricultural post-war plans.

Let me quote from a county agent's speech in Washington County, Ark. Extension Agent Clifford Smith said, "There is a lot of information being released by the United States Department of Agriculture about what the farmer should produce as war crops. Farmers should not be confused in reading this information, but should keep their production down to common crops and livestock, which they have been producing all these years."

H. S. Mobidy, president of the Washington County Farm Bureau, State of Arkansas, said, introducing a resolution at a meeting of 300 farmers in that county he condemned the Department of Agriculture for its agencies entering into the field of educating farmers on the production of food. He indicated, and I quote, "The agricultural Extension Service has been carrying on adequate educational work on the food production for the past 25 years, and is capable of continuing without any increased cost."

Needless to say, the group voted in favor of the resolution. This gives you a fair idea of the knifing that's going on at this most critical time in the whole production history of agriculture in the United States.

This gives you a fair idea that no holds will be barred in this all-out fight of farmer administration.

Let me tell you a few of the things that happened during the week of Lincoln's Birthday. Senator Smith appointed a belligerent agricultural subcommittee to investigate the food situation as a means of drumming up support for two bills backed by the Allied * * *

One of these bills was a House measure to raise parity some 10 to 15 percent as a means of automatically boosting the prices of cotton, corn, and wheat, without raising wartime livestock or poultry prices. The other was the Senate measure to prevent the inclusion of Government payments in calculating parity on crops which would have been affected by the House bill. In brief, both measures would punch holes in the ceilings on prices and would automatically start us on the road to inflation, with all the danger that would be attendant upon such a course. Here's another measure that was introduced by a Congressman from Springfield, Ill., to restore to our big cooperative holding companies the right to syphon money from the raw products of the country and stack it up on the big financial interests. And when this bill hit, neither the Farm Bureau or the farm bloc or extension group raised any objection to it at all. That ought to give you another pretty good idea as to who is and who isn't the friend of you farm people out here.

Mr. Speaker, can there be any doubt now as to just who wants to control the farmers of these United States? The Department of Agriculture is not satisfied to help and assist our farmers; it

wants to control them. It condemns those men and organizations who are the real friends of the farmer because at long last the grasping design of the Department is apparent. The American farmer will not be regimented; he will continue to maintain his independence, and this Congress will support his position.

The "cat is now out of the bag." Control is the goal of these communistically minded bureaucrats; a control that is to be exercised by paid Government agents; control through limitations on the production of farm machinery and the rationing thereof; control through the exercise of crop and meat production limitations; control through involved and conglomerate methods of price fixing; and control, ultimately, of the number of farms that may be operated in any one county and the selections of those who are to run those farms—collectivized farming, if you please, Mr. Speaker.

It is obvious, now that our lend-lease food program will suffer immeasurably because Government employees are still playing personal politics. The time has come to force them to produce or quit.

ADDITIONAL PIPE LINE TO NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution which would authorize the building of another pipe line from Texas, or from the nearest point, to New England in order to secure oil. We have suffered greatly for months in New England and on the entire east coast on account of the lack of fuel. It is an inexcusable situation, in my opinion, and should be corrected immediately. We should not be forced to undergo this privation without cause another year. Plans should be made at once to remedy it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial from the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury, New York edition, regarding supplies that should have been sent from this country, supplies which were promised but have not arrived. We cry about helping China but action is what China needs—airplanes help more than idle words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN ISLANDS AS DEFENSE BASES AND A REPLY TO REPRESENTATIVE FISH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion on the lend-lease bill which passed earlier today with the full approval of the Democrats and Republicans of this body, and rightly so, I feel that as an aftermath of that debate in the consideration of this measure my colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] has presented two problems on which I should like to make comment. On one matter I am in agreement and on another I am in vigorous disagreement.

The first proposition which the gentleman from New York appropriately brings to our consideration is the problem of island bases. The gentleman from New York, and especially the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will remember that when I spoke yesterday I called attention to certain resolutions which I presented to the Congress in March and April of 1940, asking at that time that the President, on behalf of our Government, enter into negotiations with Great Britain and France looking toward a basis of settlement whereby partial repayment of debts owed the United States resulting from World War No. 1 would come about perhaps through our possession of these islands. I did not think then, in 1940, of ownership of the islands for the physical properties themselves, the resources they held within their borders, or the people who live in those countries.

I was thinking more acutely of the necessity for a ring of strength, a citadel, a fringe of fortress domain, ranging itself about this Republic. I had the feeling which has been reaffirmed many, many times, that we were going into a war, a war which would be fought to ultimate victory because of the strength of America and the Allied Nations through our superiority in the air. The need for bases for plane outposts has been proven again and again.

That is the first matter I discuss. I feel that we can take this up appropriately even now, in the midst of a war, and that it will not cause disunity to probe its possibilities.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman, but does he not think that that ought to be discussed all over the country to find out what the public opinion is, and not go in by the back door at the Peace Conference, sneak in, and then have pronouncements made such as Uncle Shylock demanding his pound of flesh? Let us bring it out in the open, discuss it freely, to show wherein our cause lies and I do not think it will cause any disunity at all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am practically in agreement with the gentleman. None of us in this body should disrupt the war effort. I shall lean over backward to at all times go along with every program which looks toward vigorous prosecution of this war; however, I do feel island possessions and their ownership can be discussed in this body and throughout the country, if we keep a sane attitude and a steady balance.

I come now to vigorous disagreement, however, with the gentleman from New York. He understands from the questions and observations I directed to him a few minutes ago my feeling on this matter. I well realize that his remarks were couched as a criticism of the Vice President of the United States, but after discussing the Vice President and the remarks he recently made as to there perhaps being an alliance in later years between certain countries against this Nation, he, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], came to the statement, and I do not misquote him, that World War No. 1 was brought on when the Democratic Party was in power and World War No. 2 was brought on when the New Deal Party was in power.

I rose then as I rise now to say that I believe the Democratic Party or the latter group, affiliated with the Democratic Party, as he desires to call it, cannot be properly classed a war party. We have been in power in these 2 periods, during a time when the world was plunged into a catastrophe of conflict.

The gentleman from New York along with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] voted for this Nation to declare war against our common enemies of today. There was no politics on either side of the aisle about the entrance of America into the war. There might have been disagreement about the steps leading to the war, but I, as a Democrat, and the gentleman from New York as a Republican, are Members of this body in the prosecution of the war not as mere members of political parties but, thank God, as American citizens. On this floor we ought to stand together, close ranks, square our shoulders, and fight through to victory in our common cause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I, too, feel as the gentleman from West Virginia does about this matter. As a Democrat I feel that the Democratic Party has not been the cause of war but the victim of two wars.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from New York

and I are personal friends. On many of these issues we are in agreement but he has erred in his remarks today. I do trust that the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle—and I respect the gentleman from New York as a member of the bloc that I call the leadership—will refrain very carefully from remarks which might tend to be carping criticism of the efforts of the administration now in power, when we necessarily are fighting a war which we must bring as quickly as possible to a successful conclusion.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I know the gentleman has spoken from his heart and spoken sincerely. I understand perfectly his motive in making this statement. I was specifically replying to the Vice President, who said that this isolationism would lead into a third war. I had an idea that statement was directed against the minority. For that reason I discussed it. But I also brought out the fact not that they caused the war but that under two Democratic administrations we have gotten into war; not that they themselves had caused the war. That is a matter we can discuss after the war is over or in the next Presidential campaign. The fact is, however, and it cannot be denied, that we did get into those two World Wars, and this country never did get into a world war under a Republican administration.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We just got into depressions under Republican administrations.

I am glad the gentleman from New York clarifies his position, because we are together for the winning of this war.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from New York if when he voted for war he voted as a Republican or as an American?

Mr. FISH. I voted with the gentleman and everybody else in this House, because we were attacked, and I voted for war. I voted for an all-out war to final victory.

Mr. McCORMACK. As an American?

Mr. FISH. As an American.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, all this talk about getting the plans of all the other nations for after the war reminds me of an incident that occurred in my district a short time ago. Three men were deer hunting. They spotted a great, big buck deer. As they saw it,

they said, "Now, who is going to get what part of this deer?" They started to argue among themselves and could not agree. They went into a cabin and got out a deck of cards and cut the cards to see which one was going to get what part of the deer. When they came out, having agreed as to who was to get what part of the deer, the deer was gone; another man was dragging it away.

It seems to me that is exactly what will happen in this war. If we are going to look with suspicion upon what England wants out of this war, if England is going to look with suspicion on what we want out of this war, if we are going to look with suspicion upon what Russia wants out of this war, and if Russia, in turn, is going to look with suspicion upon what we want out of this war, it will do nothing but prolong the war. While we argue about the loot, someone else might come along and walk away with it.

As an American, I really think that statements such as those made by men like Admiral Standley and Vice President WALLACE lead to suspicion and prolong the war. The less we say about suspicions about one another and the more unitedly we resolve really to prosecute this war and stop the shooting, the better off we will be. We can argue about the loot afterwards. Let us get this killing stopped first. Then let us talk about who gets what.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, from March 11 to 22, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. HOLMES of Washington), from March 9 for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

You are hereby advised that the hearing on H. R. 134, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes, which was previously scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 1943, has been postponed until Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 10 a. m.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits ac-

cruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 1, 1943, at 10 a. m., on S. 163 (H. R. 498) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1766, to transfer to the Department of Agriculture certain functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service relating to the fisheries industry.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, March 16, 1943, to consider House Joint Resolution 14, authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts, House Resolution 155. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting investigation authorized by House Resolution 121 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Roads, H. R. 1940. A bill providing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads; without amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 157. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1408, a bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 771. A bill for the relief of Fisl Rosenberg and his wife Sofie; with amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2133. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2139. A bill to provide improvement in the administration of parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2140. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2141. A bill amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, to facilitate the taking of possession of real property by the purchaser; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 2142 (by request). A bill to deny employment in the Federal Government to conscientious objectors and persons refusing to subscribe to an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2143. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2144. A bill to define the exterior boundaries of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution for approval of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 156. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct an investigation of the State Department with particular reference to our policies in regard to Russia, Spain, and north Africa; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 158. Resolution to increase the oil supply in the east coast; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Res. 159. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Insular Affairs to investigate the political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memo-

rializing the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the acquisition by the United States of the interstate bridges, including the approaches across the Columbia River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to relieve all persons in the military service of income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the alcohol-production plant of the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, of Yankton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to pass House bills 1012 and 1115 and Senate bill 248; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2145. A bill for the relief of Marie A. Atanasio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 2146. A bill for the relief of Lamar Porter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 2147. A bill for the relief of Perique Gomez and Mrs. Perique Gomez; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2148. A bill for the relief of Elias Baumgarten; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2149. A bill for the relief of Sam J. Hash; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2150. A bill for the relief of Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2151. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Powers Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Rafael Torres; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

243. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of the State Legislature of Indiana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation abolishing the poll tax as a qualification for voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

244. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Furniture Workers' Union, Local No. 1541, San Francisco, relative to House bill 1366 and Senate bill 360, supporting postal employees pay increases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

245. Also, resolution of the Dental Laboratory Technicians, Union No. 99, San Francisco, relative to the rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

246. Also, resolution of the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 1327, San Francisco, relative to the rationing program

of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

247. Also, resolution of the Retail Delivery Drivers' Union, Local 278, San Francisco, relative to the rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

248. Also, resolution of the Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, relative to Japanese in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

249. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Insular League of Parent-Teachers Associations of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to keep the public-school system of Puerto Rico free from any partisan interference; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

250. Also, petition of Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, San Francisco, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to House bills 877, 880, 863, and 734; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

251. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, specialist in management and statistical control, petitioning consideration of resolution with reference to his petition No. 221 dated March 1, 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

252. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition signed by Felix Garalis and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1111; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou art the law within our minds, the life of every breath we draw, the love that yearneth in our hearts. Thou hast set eternity in our souls. In Thee alone are the fountains of living water; yet we have tried to quench our burning thirst at broken cisterns—to comfort the crying needs of our spirits with baubles bought at vanity fair, forgetting that each ounce of dross costs its ounce of gold. With shallow sophistries we have sought to stifle the pain of our deep unrest.

From shams and shadows we turn unfilled to Thee, praying for strength for our burdens, wisdom for our responsibilities, insight for our times, and vision which sets its eyes on far horizons. In our own repentant hearts may Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 10, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.